IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA

In Re:)) Case No. 08-61570
Yellowstone Mountain Club, LLC,)
Debtor.)

THE HON. RALPH B. KIRSCHER, presiding
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Butte, Montana May 15, 2009

Electronic Recording Operator: Patti Mahoney

Transcript Services:

Proceedings recorded by electronic recording; transcript produced by reporting service.

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	FOR THE DEBTORS:
4	JAMES A. PATTEN
5	Attorney at Law
6	Suite 300, The Fratt Building
7	2817 Second Avenue North
8	Billings, MT 59101
9	
10	RICHARD BIRINYI
11	Attorney at Law
12	Bullivant Houser Bailey, PC
13	1601 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2300
14	Seattle, WA 98101-1618
15	
16	FOR THE OFFICE OF THE U.S. TRUSTEE:
17	DANIEL P. McKAY
18	U.S. Trustee's Office
19	Liberty Center, Suite 204
20	301 Central Avenue
21	Great Falls, MT 59401
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES (continued)
2	
3	FOR CREDIT SUISSE:
4	MARK S. CHEHI
5	Attorney at Law
6	Skadden, Arps, Slate,
7	Meagher & Flom
8	One Rodney Square, Seventh Floor
9	Wilmington, DE 19801
10	
11	EVAN R. LEVY
12	Attorney at Law
13	Skadden, Arps, Slate,
14	Meagher & Flom
15	Four Times Square
16	New York, NY 10036-6652
17	
18	FOR THE CREDITORS COMMITTEE:
19	J. THOMAS BECKETT
20	Attorney at Law
21	Parsons, Behle & Latimer
22	201 South Main Street
23	Salt Lake City, UT 84111
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES (continued)				
2					
3	FOR THE AD HOC COMMITTEE OF YELLOWSTONE				
4	CLUB MEMBERS:				
5	JONATHAN B. ALTER				
6	Attorney at Law				
7	Bingham McCutchen, LLP				
8	One State Street				
9	Hartford, CT 06103				
10					
11	FOR THE CLASS B AD HOC MEMBERS COMMITTEE:				
12	CLARK T. WHITMORE				
13	Attorney at Law				
14	Maslon Edelman Borman & Brand, LLP				
15	3300 Wells Fargo Center				
16	90 South Seventh Street				
17	Minneapolis, MN 55402-4140				
18					
19	FOR CROSSHARBER CAPITAL PARTNERS, LLC:				
20	PAUL D. MOORE				
21	BARRY GREEN				
22	Attorneys at Law				
23	Duane Morris, LLP				
24	470 Atlantic Avenue, Suite 500				
25	Boston, MA 02210-2600				

1	APPEARANCES (continued)
2	
3	FOR TIMOTHY J. BLIXSETH:
4	JOEL E. GUTHALS
5	Attorney at Law
6	Guthals, Hunnes & Ruess, PC
7	P.O. Box 1977
8	Billings, MT 59103
9	
10	FOR THE MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE:
11	TERESA GRACE WHITNEY
12	Attorney at Law
13	Montana Department of Revenue
14	P.O. Box 7701
15	Helena, MT 59604-7701
16	
17	FOR YELLOWSTONE CLUB WORLD, LLC:
18	JON AMSDEN
19	Attorney at Law
20	Back & Amsden, PLLC
21	1946 Stadium Drive, Suite 1
22	Bozeman, MT 59715
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES (continued)
2	
3	FOR THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE:
4	VICTORIA LAEDER FRANCIS
5	Assistant US Attorney
6	P.O. Box 1478
7	Billings, MT 59103-1478
8	
9	FOR MARK GROSVENOR, GREG LeMOND:
10	TRENT M. GARDNER
11	Attorney at Law
12	Goetz, Gallik & Baldwin, PC
13	P.O. Box 6580
14	Bozeman, MT 59771-6580
15	
16	FOR GREG LeMOND:
17	DAVID L. MITCHELL
18	Attorney at Law
19	Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi
20	800 Lasalle Avenue, Suite 2800
21	Minneapolis, MN 55402-2015
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX						
2	WITNESS:					PA	GE:
3	RONALD GREENSPAN						
4	Direct Examination by Mr. Patten			•	•	•	52
5	Cross-Examination by Mr. Guthals	•	•			•	67
6	Cross-Examination by Mr. Moore		•	•	•	•	77
7	Cross-Examination by Mr. Chehi	•	•			•	79
8	Cross-Examination by Mr. Whitmore		•	•	•	•	81
9	Redirect Examination by Mr. Patten		•	•	•	•	85
10	SAMUEL T. BYRNE						
11	Direct Examination by Mr. Patten			•	•	•	89
12	STEVEN LEHR						
13	Direct Examination by Mr. Patten	•	•	•	•	•	91
14	EDRA BLIXSETH						
15	Direct Examination by Mr. Patten		•	•	•	•	96
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

YELLOWSTONE MOUNTAIN CLUB BANKRUPTCY

BUTTE, MONTANA

3

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT this matter came on for hearing on May 18, 2009, in the United States Bankruptcy Court, District of Montana, The Hon. Ralph B. Kirscher, presiding:

8

9

1

2

4

5

6

7

The following proceedings were had:

10

11

THE COURT: Please be seated.

Who wishes to give me an update? Mr. Patten?

MR. PATTEN: Your Honor, I'll allow the others to

14 give details, but after we left the courthouse Friday

15 evening, settlement discussions continued and progressed

16 over the weekend. And I believe that there's now a fully

17 | executed term sheet, that a copy can be provided to the

18 | Court. And I'll let Mr. Levy and Mr. Green describe the

19 details.

20

21

22

23

24

25

There remain a couple objections that have not been resolved. Most of the other objections have been resolved. They haven't necessarily been reduced to writing, and Mr. Birinyi can describe which ones have been resolved and which ones remain. But I think we're down to a couple objections; and, otherwise, we'll have everyone on

```
board with the plan. The plan will be modified per the
1
 2
     term sheet. It's our view that it doesn't require
     resolicitation of bids that we can simply --
 3
 4
                THE COURT: Is it consensual?
                MR. PATTEN: -- incorporate it into the plan.
 5
 6
                THE COURT: Because it's consensual?
 7
                MR. PATTEN: Yes.
                THE COURT: It will be a consensual plan --
 8
                MR. PATTEN: Yes.
 9
10
                THE COURT: -- provided the two objectors are
11
     resolved?
12
                MR. PATTEN: Yes.
13
                THE COURT: Okay. That's progress.
                MR. PATTEN: And with that, I'd leave it to
14
15
     Mr. Green.
16
                THE COURT: Okay. I'm not going to volunteer a
     lot for the record at this point if there's a resolution.
17
18
                So Mr. Green.
                MR. GREEN: Good morning, Your Honor, and thank
19
20
     you again for your help last week. We're all thrilled to
21
     be here with signed settlement term sheets.
22
                THE COURT: Have they been signed?
23
                MR. GREEN:
                            Yes.
                THE COURT: Wonderful.
24
                MR. GREEN: Your Honor should know that there's
25
```

one exhibit to the term sheet, which is the new credit agreement for the 80 million loan portion of the consideration. And Mr. Levy and I are around 15 percent through just marking that document up. It's going to take us another hour to finish it. We're going to go into a conference room while you hear the objections. We have every confidence that we will have no problem finishing it up. But the constituents wanted that to be attached as an exhibit, and we've all agreed to that. But I did want to alert the Court to that.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Levy.

MR. LEVY: Yes, Your Honor. This settlement addresses all the concerns of all parties - the UCC, the debtors, and the prepetition lenders - to address all of the outstanding litigation matters, appeal matters, and the plan objections. There is one matter we'd like to approach the Court to -- approach the bench to discuss with the Court relating to the settlement.

THE COURT: Okay. I have a question concerning your settlement documents. Now, what is your intention as far as -- or is that document between the parties and to be left between the parties, or is that something that would be docketed?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's incorporated into the plan.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's incorporated into the 2 plan. MR. PATTEN: Your Honor, the terms of the 3 4 settlement will be incorporated into the plan and modify the plan. 5 6 THE COURT: Okay, okay. Mr. Chehi. 7 MR. CHEHI: And just to be a little bit more 8 clear about that, the plan will incorporate a Rule 9019 9 settlement, which will, in effect, be a global settlement. Effectuating this, various terms of the plan will be 10 11 modified to conform to the settlement, to make provisions 12 for various things that are required under the settlement 13 agreement. And the parties hope to accomplish that, you 14 know, as rapidly as possible, given the fact that it takes 15 awhile, as you understand now, to actually document the 16 agreements. We should be able to get to the plan documents rather rapidly. 17

THE COURT: Okay.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CHEHI: And then, you know, to the extent that the Court would require a resolicitation of parties other than, I think, the secured creditors who had rejected the plan, the Class 3 and Class 8, you know, there would be some sort of, hopefully, accelerated notice of some sort to whoever the Court would feel requires to be resolicited, if anybody. There would have to be an opportunity, I think,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for the Class 3 and class 8 lender, holders of lender claims to recast their ballots in favor of the plan, because at this point, they've reject the plan. THE COURT: Okav. MR. LEVY: And if I could just say one point on While we're not soliciting or resoliciting outside of the process, we have consulted with lenders holding a majority of the interest in the loan. Those lenders constitute requisite lenders under our credit agreement, those lenders have authorized and directed the prepetition agent to enter into the settlement agreement, and have also indicated to the agent that they intend to vote in favor of the plan as modified contemplated by the term sheet. THE COURT: Very good, thank you. Mr. Patten. MR. PATTEN: Well, I'm not sure that resoliciting ballots is necessary. I think, in our view, we wanted to get confirmation completed today, if possible. THE COURT: Well, if, in fact, it's consensual and we have representatives that can change their ballots or withdraw any objections or can agree to file, I mean I think we can move the process. MR. CHEHI: Your Honor, as it became apparent in connection with the solicitation process, there are

numerous, numerous holders of prepetition lender claims

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that exceed the holders' -- the identity of the holders on the steering committee, which hold, you know, a dominant amount of claims, and the like, but are nevertheless not all of the holders. I think it will be necessary to have an opportunity for the -- to resolicit those lenders who have already voted to change their vote on the plan. Because we can't change their votes on the plan. couldn't vote for them in the first place, the steering committee couldn't vote for them in the first place. steering committee has indicated, pursuant to the settlement, that they are going to be recommending that people support the plan as modified incorporating the settlement. And we, you know, are highly confident that will be the outcome here. But we actually have to go true that mechanic, which again, we can do on a, you know, very accelerated basis, giving notice to the folks what it is, probably attaching a copy of this and saying that the plan is going to be conformed and we ask that you vote for -you know, we'll give them a new ballot, or something, that reflects this, and they can vote to accept the plan as modified consistent with this. MR. PATTEN: I'm not sure if there's another purpose being accomplished here, but we have, under the

ballots that have been filed - and we filed the ballot

reports with the Court this morning - we have the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

affirmative ballots of several impaired classes that -- we meet the balloting requirement. So I'm not sure that we need the prepetition lender's vote in order to overcome that hurdle. I'm not sure how we're going to --THE COURT: Well, it's probably a cleaner deal if they're all on board. MR. PATTEN: Yes. MR. MOORE: Your Honor, if I may, Paul Moore or CrossHarbor. I think we can address it in a different way. I've had this issue in other cases. If the Court were to approve the settlement and the plan incorporates the treatment under the settlement, then the case law suggests that they are unimpaired. We change their treatment to unimpaired, and we treat them in accordance with the settlement. And I've got a couple citations for that proposition, if you would like. THE COURT: That may be the way to go. sensing that, that Mr. Chehi and the prepetition lenders and the lending -- the prepetition lenders, he'd like to have their ballots in there. MR. CHEHI: We don't want to disenfranchise the numerous holders of the claims. And, again, I think it can be done on a very expressed type of basis. Everyone has been kept are pretty well informed.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
THE COURT:
                      When you say that, how long do you
think? What are we talking about on an "expressed basis"?
          MR. MOORE: Your Honor, when the ballots -
(inaudible) - mailed, we got 111 ballots back within a
week. So we were able to convince our lender group that it
was important and they should vote. We didn't tell them
how to vote; we just told them they should. I would
suspect if we have the authorization of the appropriate
ballot, we could push it to our lenders today or tomorrow
morning with an indication to return it probably by Friday
before the holiday weekend. And I would expect to get back
most of them.
          MR. BIRINYI: Your Honor, KCC, our balloting
agent --
          THE COURT: I'm sorry, you need to --
          MR. BIRINYI: Your Honor, Richard Birinyi.
          KCC, the balloting agent, has the capacity,
literally -- they have an office in Memphis. So they have
the capacity to get something into overnight mail almost
instantaneously. If we decide that we have to go that way,
then we could send it out probably before the close of
business today with a balloting deadline of Friday, as
suggested.
          THE COURT: Well, I guess I'm wondering, can
something like that, rather than mailing it, can it be
```

e-mailed as an attachment to your group?

MR. LEVY: We have an electronic posting system called "Interlinks" that all of our lenders are linked to. So if we have the new ballot, they would get it instantaneously through Interlinks.

MR. CHEHI: And the benefit of doing the solicitation and the resolicitation of those lenders for purposes of getting their votes and acceptance is, then, once that class is voted by the requisite majorities, then it binds, it's binding on everybody. And I think that's just the right thing to do here.

THE COURT: Yeah, yeah. I don't disagree. Given the numbers that we're dealing with, the numbers of people that we're dealing with, I don't want to hold this thing up any longer than it needs to be. But if we can get some stuff out to them through the various connections that were just discussed by counsel, we could have something back -- I mean we might be seeing those coming back to the, to the balloting agent by this afternoon, potentially.

MR. PATTEN: Well, Your Honor, I guess what I would propose, then, is, one, that the Court order a short deadline on the reballot of that class. Can we proceed with confirmation today, have everybody in town for it, and then maybe just hold off, hopefully, on the order until these ballots come in?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I promised Mr. Whitmore I would advise -- I said "everybody was on board". I'm not speaking for the Class B members when I say that.

THE COURT: They're not on board?

MR. WHITMORE: Your Honor, we have not been invited to participate in the settlement to date. I stand here afraid that I'll be struck by lightening if I -- we want there to be a settlement, we're supportive of a settlement, but there are some -- we have objected to the plan. We've filed a conditional objection. We received an extension of time to object to the plan until two days after the auction. As you know, that timing ended up a little bit different. We have some things that we're going to need added to the plan just to protect our interests as Class B holders because we didn't get baked into the settlement. And so we want to reserve our rights with respect to the plan of reorganization just until a couple of sentences can be added, frankly. And so it sounds like there's going to be enough time anyway for that to be accommodated.

But our principal concern is that the Class B holders have an equity stake at the very -- you know, in the scheme of things, they had a 1 percent -- each had a 1 percent stake in the Yellowstone Mountain Club. And at a time, that was worth a lot of money. It was an

unencumbered asset. And due to a variety of things that occurred, that equity stake became diminished in value greatly. And that was a result of, we believe, some wrongful acts by some various parties.

And we've commenced litigation against

Mr. Blixseth, Edra Blixseth, and BGI. And in connection

with that, we're seeking equitable subordination of the

equity stakes that BGI and Edra have in the, in the club.

And I believe Mr. Blixseth's equity stake has already been

departed with or he's transferred that away.

But we may -- we would like to preserve the right to do whatever the Class B holders want to do to vindicate their personal rights - not rights that belong to the estates - in connection with this whole mess. And we're a little bit concerned that the settlement involves turning over of control of the liquidating trust to Credit Suisse; although, we're on the board, as well. And there are some provisions in the plan that provide that only the liquidating trustee has the right to pursue claims objections, and those claims objections would include subordinations of claims.

And we are very -- we just want to make sure that our rights to pursue our existing equitable subordination litigation against Edra and BGI is preserved and, frankly, to preserve whatever equitable subordination rights we may

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
want to pursue as it may -- it won't stop the sale, won't
stop the settlement, but at the back end of the waterfall,
we want the right to come to Court and be heard about where
we ought to sit in that. And if that can be accommodated,
we're more than happy to step aside. We don't have any
real concerns about the other economics of the settlement.
We're supportive of it, we're happy that it occurred.
          But we can't -- we're a little bit reluctant to
stand here today and say, "We'll just let other parties
completely rewrite the plan, and we'll all approve that
whatever they say is just fine."
          THE COURT: Well, have you discussed these two
sentences with Mr. Patten or counsel?
          MR. WHITMORE: I've tried, but they just finished
this term sheet, I think, in the middle of the night, Your
Honor.
          THE COURT:
                      Okay.
          MR. CHEHI: You know, we've indicated --
          THE COURT:
                      Mr. Chehi.
          MR. CHEHI: -- to counsel for the B's that we are
amenable to making a statement on the record, which I'll
make now.
          And that is that: This settlement and the plan
of reorganization is without prejudice to the rights and
opportunities of the liquidating trust and the "B" holders
to reach some sort of resolution or settlement of their
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

interests in respect of the waterfall - which is the liquidating trust assets at the end of the day - such that, you know, following the effective date of the plan, the liquidating trust and the B's can enter into some sort of understanding or agreement about how their interests might be treated.

I would also say that, you know, the B's just admitted their equity. They seem to have a dispute with other equity in the case. And, you know, we don't have a problem if they want to reserve their rights to, in some sense, subordinate, you know, other equity interests that otherwise would be pari passu with them to -- to them, but we're not agreeable to having them reserve their rights to somehow take a second bite at the apple and equitably subordinate any claims of any creditors, which are part of this waterfall scheme. Because this settlement represents a compromise of the various -- the priorities that would otherwise exist under the code and otherwise with respect to our secured claims and our deficiency claims, which all are claims and not equity interests at the end of the day. And so, that, we would not be agreeable to, but to the extent they want to reserve their rights to equitably subordinate other equity interest in the case, we don't have a problem with that. I don't know what the other parties have to say.

And, again, we all do look forward to working to come up with a consensual resolution, including some language that we could put in the confirmation order or the plan that would reflect what I've just said.

MR. WHITMORE: I'm sorry to -- I don't want to dwell on this at this point, but I think Mr. Chehi started out by indicating that if Credit Suisse elects to enter into an agreement with us, that he would remain flexible enough so that that agreement could be effected. And in terms of preserving our rights, I was a little concerned about that stopping short of what we're asking for.

We're simply saying that we have some personal rights. Equitable subordination isn't really an estate right; it's really our right. We're not baked into the revised waterfall right now and -- because we're not a party to the agreement. And if they want to change the waterfall, all we're asking is that whatever equitable rights we may have to come to the Court and ask for an adjustment of that waterfall down the road, based on the harms that other people in this case have done to us, our personal rights, that those are not forfeit as a result of an agreement where everybody else has shared consideration and worked out their own issues and not included us. And I --

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Whitmore, you're talking

about claims that the "B" members have against other equity interests.

MR. WHITMORE: Well, that's part of it. But there's also a claim, Your Honor, that Credit Suisse, by making -- by engaging in this lending transaction with Mr. Blixseth may have done so with a knowledge that the effect of what was going to happen was that Mr. Blixseth wasn't going to be sharing -- or the equity distributions that should have happened to our class at the time didn't happen. You know, that's something -- it's not in litigation now; hopefully, it will never be in litigation. We're trying to, you know, work through that issue. But if there's something that a nondebtor did that caused harm to another nondebtor, then, you know, all rights and privileges related to, you know, those claims are preserved.

THE COURT: You know, it sounds like the B's should be -- you want so much of this money. You should be putting in some money.

MR. WHITMORE: Well, Your Honor, I think what we're, what we're possibly talking about would be contributing the claims that the Class B holders have against certain parties into the liquidation trust and then joining forces with the liquidating trust to work effectively rather than potentially being at

1 cross-purposes. So we are trying to -- we're just trying 2 to work through that issue. And while we're getting that sorted out, since 3 4 this all just happened in the middle of the night, I'm just asking the Court not to approve a settlement that affects 5 6 our rights; certainly, at a minimum, to say that our right 7 to object to the plan is preserved, and we'll deal with it 8 later. THE COURT: Well, but you're not a signatory to 9 10 the term sheet, right? 11 MR. WHITMORE: I'm sorry? 12 THE COURT: You're not a signatory to the term 13 sheet. 14 MR. WHITMORE: I'm not a signatory to the term 15 sheet. And if nothing --16 THE COURT: How can whatever rights you have be affected? 17 MR. WHITMORE: Well, as long as this Court 18 19 doesn't go through the short step, short step that someone 20

MR. WHITMORE: Well, as long as this Court doesn't go through the short step, short step that someone was suggesting that, by approving the agreement, that somehow it becomes dictated over our potential objections to the plan, that the plan will be changed in accordance with the term sheet, you're right, we're not a party to it. And if the Court wants to approve it, subject to a reservation of whatever rights we have to object to the

21

22

23

24

25

plan, and those aren't affected, that's fine for purposes of this morning.

THE COURT: Mr. Patten.

MR. PATTEN: Your Honor, it seems to me that the equity is the last person in line to get paid. And if, ultimately, there's money or property to distribute to the equity, then the A's and the B's can fight over that money at that point in time. And I don't think the plan is preclusive of the A's and B's fighting over whatever would be distributed to them.

I do think, though, that the settlement reach with Credit Suisse by the estate, by the debtors, is binding on the B's. The B's claim derive through the debtors, and so it seems to me that the settlement that — if this Court approves it, that settlement will be binding on the B's. To the extent the B's have claims against other parties, then that's different. And if the B's and the liquidating trust want to work out some arrangement where they contribute their B's claim into the liquidating trust, as long as the "A" interests have the ability to participate in the discussions, the, you know, objective, if the A's are somehow being cut out, then I don't think there's any, any problem that we have with the B's.

It just seems to me that the plan doesn't preclude what Mr. Whitmore is concerned about, and that's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

just a fight that will have to be made down the road if there's any property to distribute to the equity. THE COURT: Okay. MR. GUTHALS: Your Honor, this is Joel Guthals in Billings. May I speak? THE COURT: You may. Thank you, Your Honor. Today, Your MR. GUTHALS: Honor, I'm representing Mr. Blixseth, who's objected to the confirmation of the plan; and also Desert Ranch, LLLP, which is a transferee of the claim of Prim. And I have filed objections to confirmation on behalf of both of my clients, neither of whom are signatories to the settlement nor know anything about the settlement. I understand from the dynamics of this case, as I have been involved in it for quite awhile, that the plan is likely to be confirmed, given the settlement that is reached. But I did want to state for the record that the settlement, to my knowledge, does not resolve the objections of my two clients. THE COURT: Okay. MR. GUTHALS: Thank you. MR. AMSDEN: Your Honor, John Amsden, counsel for Ross Richardson; Chapter 7 trustee for Yellowstone Club World. We had filed limited objections to the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

confirmation of the plan. I've talked to Mr. Patten and Mr. Birinyi about that, and I think that they are resolved. And, hopefully, with some clarifying language, either separately or a part of the plan, we would withdraw our objection. The general concept is that Ross Richardson will have a full and fair opportunity to establish the amount and proper classification of his claim and that the exculpatory provisions in the plan won't affect any of Mr. Richardson's potential claim against any other persons or matters outside the scope of various principals, either prepetition or postpetition. But we're working with Mr. Patten on that and hope to get that resolved. THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Francis? MS. FRANCIS: Yes, Your Honor. I'm here on behalf of the IRS. I do believe we can reach a stipulation, but due to the focus on all the many ongoing hearings and

I do believe we can reach a stipulation, but due to the focus on all the many ongoing hearings and settlement discussions, haven't had a chance to finalize that. My concern is that there's some outstanding tax returns that remain to be filed. I believe that the debtors have indicated that they would endeavor to file those in the near future. I would like a defined date. And I don't think the plan can be confirmed unless the tax returns are filed because you must pay the priority claim, and we cannot determine what the total priority claim is

until the tax returns are filed. I've itemized the remaining returns in our objection.

So I would ask that we be allowed to file a stipulation and that the confirmation be subject to both of us filing the stipulation so we can work out -- I think it's highly likely we will resolve these, but until that's done, I can't withdraw my objection.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. PATTEN: Your Honor, I'm told that the unfiled return is a fourth-quarter 2007 941 return. We believe and will commit to file it before the effective date of the plan.

THE COURT: Okay. Is that correct, Ms. Francis?

MS. FRANCIS: As long as they have a date. I

think they were intending on doing that, in filing the

effective date. And then the priority claim has to be

paid. I think they indicate they're going to pay it, but

I'm not sure if there's enough money - based on everything

else, because I haven't seen the settlement terms - to pay

it. So our priority claim has to be paid.

And I don't know if the settlement has enough money to pay us, Andy.

MR. PATTEN: Unless that claim is unbelievably huge, there will be sufficient money to pay a priority tax claim on the effective date.

```
1
                THE COURT: And it's just a fourth-quarter 941,
     right?
 2
                MR. BIRINYI: That's the only one that's unfiled.
 3
 4
     There is some existing claim --
                THE COURT: Oh, okay.
 5
                MR. BIRINYI: -- that we do know about that was
 6
 7
     included in the numbers that we talked about last week,
 8
     Your Honor. I think the taxing authorities' total were --
                MR. WHITMORE: Well, actually, it's the
 9
10
     Yellowstone Mountain Club's fourth quarter, the Yellowstone
     Development's fourth quarter 2007, the Yellowstone Club
11
12
     Construction's fourth quarter 2007, and the partnership
     return for 2006 and 2007 for Yellowstone Club Construction.
13
14
                THE COURT: Is that your understanding?
15
                MR. PATTEN: Yes.
16
                THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Green -- oh.
17
                MS. WHITNEY: Good morning, Your Honor. Teresa
18
     Whitney with the Montana Department of Revenue.
                We had also filed an objection based on the
19
20
     exculpation provision in Paragraph 8.4 of the plan. And we
21
     have been in contact with Debtors' counsel regarding
22
     proposed language that we would like to see in the plan
23
     regarding the Montana Department of Revenue.
24
                And I believe I was sent an e-mail late last
25
     night or late yesterday, and I did not have an opportunity
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to review the language. They made some changes to it. I've been assured that it basically encompasses what we requested in our proposed language. And once I get back to the office, I will review that language. If it does substantially state what we wanted, then our objection is cured in that plan. THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Thank you. MS. WHITNEY: MR. BIRINYI: Your Honor, on that issue - Richard Birinyi again - the IRS wanted some additional language in the plan, too. And the language that I circulated Saturday morning attempted to address both the IRS-requested additional language and the Montana Department of Revenue's. So we will work that out in the process of producing the modified plan documents so that it will be acceptable to both the IRS and the Montana Department of Revenue. THE COURT: Okay, very good. Mr. Green. MR. GREEN: Your Honor, I'm not sure -- I understand you have a copy of the settlement term sheet. I'm not sure if you're interested in us describing the terms of it. And there's also one matter, as Mr. Levy mentioned, that we wanted to discuss with you at bench side. THE COURT: Okay.

```
1
                MR. GREEN:
                            So however you would like to proceed.
 2
                THE COURT: For the sidebar, how many are
     involved?
 3
 4
                UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Many. A big, happy
     family.
 5
 6
                THE COURT: Four people?
 7
                UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Five people.
                THE COURT: Five people? You know, because of
 8
     the limitation of -- I mean there's quite a bit of space up
 9
     here, but there's some limitation. Why don't the five --
10
11
     whoever is involved with the sidebar, let's just go in the
12
     jury room right back there.
13
                Okay, we'll be in recess for just a moment.
14
                (A brief recess was taken.)
15
                THE COURT: Please be seated.
16
                MR. GREEN: Your Honor.
17
                THE COURT:
                            Mr. Green.
18
                MR. GREEN: Barry Green for CrossHarbor Capital.
19
     I'm here with Evan Levy from Skadden-Arps, representing
     Credit Suisse.
20
21
                As Your Honor knows, we have a fully executed
22
     settlement term sheet. And Mr. Levy and I will walk
23
     through the basic parameters of that, starting with,
24
     frankly, who the parties are to the settlement term sheet.
25
     They are each of the debtor entities, so Yellowstone
```

Mountain Club, Yellowstone Development, Big Sky Ridge, and Yellowstone construction -- Yellowstone Club Construction Company.

Then the Official Committee of Unsecured

Creditors has executed the document; as has Credit Suisse,
as prepetition agent for the prepetition lenders; as has
the acquirer under the definitive agreement, the parties
submitting the stalking-horse bid, has also executed the
settlement term sheet.

In addition, a number of CrossHarbor entities have joined in the settlement term sheet for purposes of reflecting their agreement to the releases set forth in the term sheet. And these CrossHarbor affiliates are entities that have interests within the Yellowstone Club either because they are the DIP lender or they hold an interest in the prepetition loan or they are the ultimate parent entity. So that's who the parties are to the document.

The document, as stated earlier, effectuates a global settlement between these parties relating to the matters that have been before the Court. Very quickly, I'll hit some of the highlights, and Mr. Levy will chime in from time to time, I'm sure, as well.

There are numerous stipulations, Your Honor, regarding dismissal of the pending appeal for the CrossHarbor DIP loan. That's going to be withdrawn, and

the parties agree to support the plan as modified by this term sheet. In addition, the parties agree to support the Skadden-Arps fee applications to the extent that money is left within the interim DIP for payment of their fees; and, likewise, the parties agree to support the motions for CrossHarbor's legal fees to the extent funds are available within the CrossHarbor final DIP loan for payment of those fees. Obviously, both of those, to the extent required, are subject to your court's -- to the Court's approval.

Do you want to do the next part about the settlement in terms of the lawsuits?

MR. LEVY: Sure. The parties have agreed, as between the debtors, the UCC, and the prepetition agent of the prepetition lenders to dismiss all of the litigation in the two adversary proceedings. We had made a request -- or are making a request to the Court to consider the Court's rulings with respect for interim and partial rulings with respect to the adversary proceedings in light of the settlement of the overall proceedings. None of those settlements will affect any claims that have been asserted against Mr. Blixseth, which are still before this Court. The settlement also provides for releases of all parties for all the claims that were made in those adversary proceedings other than the actions that remain before this Court with respect to Mr. Blixseth.

Okay. The term sheets -- or in addition to stipulations, the term sheet had three components. One stipulation of the parties is really dealing with the settlement of litigated matters; secondly, agreed-upon modifications to the CrossHarbor definitive agreement with the debtors to acquire the equity in the reorganized debtors; and, third, agreements to modification of the plan of reorganization to address both the changes in the definitive agreement and the economic rights and sharings of the various parties.

Do you want to talk about the definitive agreement?

MR. GREEN: Yeah. Why don't I start with how the definitive agreement is being modified. And as Your Honor noted last week, some of these may sound familiar. First of all, the purchase price under the definitive agreement is being increased from 100 million to 115 million, the debt portion will increase from 70 million to 80 million, and the cash portion will increase from 30 million to 35 million.

We then have a series - and I won't go into tremendous detail on them - a series of amendments to what is a permitted construction financing under the, under the definitive agreement loan documents that will be delivered. And they relate to including that an institutional lender

must provide it, a \$45 million aggregate limit on vertical construction, subordinate senior financing with 50 residential density units being effected at any one point in time. That 50 represent as decrease from 100, and the 45 million is a new provision. There's also provisions limiting loan to costs as well as payments to affiliates of the CrossHarbor and Discovery entities to the extent that those fees are -- need to be market-rate based.

We've also agreed, as we indicated at the beginning of the hearing, that we would use a form of credit agreement similar to that that was used in connection with the original loan. Mr. Levy and I will excuse ourselves shortly after this presentation to finish marking that document up. We should have that done within 90 minutes, or so.

I think the other agreement that also relates to the amendments to the definitive agreement and is really a CrossHarbor/Credit Suisse matter is we are giving Credit Suisse the ability to co-invest in the acquisition of the reorganized debtors. They'll have that open until we actually close and the plan becomes effective.

Want to do the plan modifications?

MR. LEVY: I thought I'd walk through the proposed modifications to the plan of reorganization. Firstly, the trade creditor fund, which was identified in

the plan of reorganization as \$7.5 million, will be doubled to \$15 million. Also, the control and governance of that trade creditor fund will be modified to provide that it will be administered by the official unsecured creditors committee in consultation with both CrossHarbor and the ad hoc committee members.

In addition to that, the liquidating trust will be established with more substantial funds to pursue claims and recoveries for all of the creditors. The amount being funded to liquidating the trust at closing will be increased by \$2 million, from \$375,000 to \$2,375,000.

The governance of the liquidating trust is also being addressed. The liquidating trust will be established with a seven-member board. Four of the members will be appointed by the prepetition agent, two by the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors, and one by the ad hoc Class B members. The parties have also agreed to designate initial counsel for the liquidating trust. The concern is the trust should proceed actively to maximize the recovery of all stakeholders. And Holland & Hart has been designated as the initial counsel to represent the trust in obtaining further recoveries for the creditors and other stakeholders.

There are certain designated matters. All matters of the liquidating trust will require the majority

vote of the board with two exceptions: Any removal of legal counsel or retention of additional legal counsel will require a unanimous vote; and resolution or settlement of certain designated matters, which are attached as an exhibit to the settlement term sheet, will require a five-member vote of the board.

Initially, those designated claims that require the five-member vote, the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors will take the lead in attempting to settle those matters during a 45-day period, will have the exclusive right to seek to settle those claims in a 45-day period. The distributions out of the liquidating trust were also addressed and a waterfall of sorts was identified to establish the ranking or priority of payments of recoveries out of the liquidating trust. The first \$2 million will be funded to the trade creditor fund to, again, increase the trade creditor fund from \$15 million to \$17 million.

Secondly, up to \$15 million will be paid to CIP lending. The DIP lender, the initial funder of the trade creditor fund, they'll have the right to recover 15 million to the extent the trade creditor fund was used to pay or to purchase allowed Class 4 claims, unsecured claims.

Third in the waterfall, an additional \$10 million will go to pay allowed Class 4 general unsecured claims.

And the balance of any recoveries will be shared pro rata

among all allowed unsecured claims -- all allowed claims, both secured and unsecured.

It was also contemplated that the debt portion of the payable under the definitive agreement, the \$80 million promissory note, will be allocated exclusively to the Class 3 claims, the prepetition secured claims.

Similarly, the prepetition claims will be allocated all recoveries from the Farcheville property to pay the prepetition secured and unsecured claims of the prepetition lenders.

The agreement then provides the plan will be modified to include the prepetition agent and prepetition lenders as exculpated parties under Section 8.4 of the plan and also provides for the exchange of mutual releases between the parties that are parties to the settlement agreement.

The settlement will be subject to Court approval under Section -- or Bankruptcy Procedure 9019. And there are contemplated provisions relating to the Court's existing interim partial order and other orders that reference those. As Mr. Green said, there is an ability to co-invest.

The DIP loan. There's a request being made for the Court to extend the DIP loan to the earlier of June 30th or the closing date under the definitive agreement --

1 June 30th? 2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh I'm sorry, that's the -- (inaudible, out of range of microphone.) 3 MR. LEVY: -- right, June 30th, to allow time for 4 the plan to be modified and the closing to occur without 5 6 the DIP loan expiring, which I believe expires this 7 Wednesday. I think Mr. Green has two other things he needs 8 to add. 9 10 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Green. 11 MR. GREEN: We're communicating very well these 12 days. 13 One of the stipulations that we neglected to 14 mention was that CIP Lending, which is the holder of the 15 first mortgage lien on Porcupine Creek, has agreed to forbear from completing its foreclosure sale on that 16 property to the earlier -- to occur on July 30 and 30 days 17 18 after the effective date. One additional item in terms of the way the cash 19 20 proceeds are flowing, just so Your Honor understands, with 21 respect to the 5 million increase in the purchase price, 22 the cash portion, a small amount of that is going to go, we 23 expect, to admins. I think it's approximately -- it's less 24 than \$1 million. As Mr. Levy mentioned, 2 million of that 25 is going to the -- from the disbursing agent to the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
liquidating trust to cede expense money. And then the
unsecured creditors, through the trade creditor fund, gets
that money back.
          In addition, to that, the gap amount, that little
bit over $2 million will also be used for the payment of
general unsecured claims so that -- just wanted to make
sure that there was a full tracing of that full 35 cash
portion.
          THE COURT: Mr. Beckett?
          MR. BECKETT: Just a clarification:
amount, the excess amount, does not go to general unsecured
claims; it goes back up into the trade creditor fund.
          UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Fair enough.
          MR. BECKETT: And so while he's checking, Your
Honor, that brings the trade creditor fund - which was at
7.5, then went to 15 - to $19 million.
          MR. GREEN: Almost 20. I think we both agree
that's basically it.
          MR. LEVY: Thank you, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: Okay, thank you. I appreciate the
information.
          Now, I just wanted to clarify -- well, let me
take up with the debtors. That's fine, thank you.
          MR. PATTEN: Your Honor, what I'd like to do is
have Mr. Birinyi go through the other remaining objections,
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
most of which has been resolved. But I'd like Mr. Birinyi
to address those, and then we can -- we haven't resolved
every objection, so we'll need to go through the
evidentiary part.
          THE COURT:
                      Okay.
          MR. PATTEN: And we'll do that after
Mr. Birinyi's done.
          THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Birinyi.
          MR. LEVY: Your Honor, if you have no more
questions for me or Mr. Green, we would like to continue
working on our new credit agreement.
          THE COURT:
                      Absolutely.
          MR. LEVY: Thank you, Your Honor.
          MR. BIRINYI: Good morning, Your Honor. Richard
Birinyi.
          Let me go through -- I don't know how you have
them set up, but we have resolved with Mr. Grosvenor --
          UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Grosvenor.
          MR. BIRINYI: Mr. Grosvenor. His objection was
basically -- or primarily to the amount of the cure listed
in the schedule of assumed contracts. He has actually got
a purchase and sale agreement for one of the condominium
units in the Warren Miller Lodge that has not closed. He
spent a significant amount of money in upgrades when the
company didn't have enough money to finish the build-out of
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
the unit and basically didn't -- the debtor didn't have
enough money to close. We put a zero amount in as a
placeholder for the cure. That closing is still to take
place. CrossHarbor, as the buyer, has assumed the
          There may be a shortfall in the payment of the
American Bank lien to get clear title. That's going to be
CrossHarbor's obligation under the plan. To the extent
that there's any little fluff cure amount, that's going to
be the estate's obligation. And the estate, as a Class 2
creditors, there's a bunch of construction liens on the
unit that will be cleaned up as a Class 2 claim.
          So we just wanted to put on the record that we
have reached an agreement that the zero dollar amount in
the schedule is not binding because the people need to work
through the closing.
          And I think his counsel is in court.
          THE COURT:
                      So I guess to clarify, how was his
vote?
          MR. BIRINYI: I believe he voted in favor of the
plan.
          THE COURT: Okay.
          MR. BIRINYI: The objection was just to clarify
the zero dollar amount placeholder in the schedule of
assumed contracts.
          THE COURT: Okay, very good.
```

MR. GARDNER: Your Honor, Trent Gardner for Mark 1 2 Grosvenor. And we did vote for the plan. As Mr. Birinyi 3 stated, it was more of a clarification. We'll need to get 4 together after all of this to come up with a final dollar 5 6 amount for closing. 7 THE COURT: Okay, very good. Thank you. MR. GARDNER: Thank you. 8 MR. BIRINYI: The next objection is, I think, the 9 LeMond Group. And there are two different -- there's 10 11 Mr. LeMond's individual claim -- or individual objection 12 that's based on his, I guess you would say the promotional wage claim that's different than the settlement claim for 13 14 his "B" shareholders; and then there's his collective 15 claim. As I understand it, based on the provision of the 16 term sheet that authorizes the unsecured creditors 17 18 committee to be the exclusive negotiating agent with 19 respect to those claims for the first 45 days, they're 20 withdrawing their objections. 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 MR. BIRINYI: So I think that's resolved as an 23 adjunct to the term sheet. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BIRINYI: Oh, there was one clarification.

As he stood up, I remembered that I forgot the one clarification. And everybody is in agreement that -- and it was not the intent, so this is -- it's no different.

Mr. LeMond and these other folks, because they have residual claims, they are also pioneer members. And if you recall under the provisions related to pioneer members to achieve uniformity with respect to the pioneer membership claims going forward, the plan provides that the old membership agreements were rejected and those people had an option to enter into new pioneer agreements with the reorganized debtor going forward after the effective date.

Some of the language in that election on the ballot could be read as saying that they waive their claims that were independent of the pioneer membership claims, which is the -- they are claims based on the settlement agreement of their "B" -- of their shareholder litigation and the -- and Mr. LeMond's claim. We've agreed that those claims will continue to be in existence in the estate, subject to your resolution, and not -- and nobody will assert that the ballot waiver and election to take the new membership waives those claims. I think I said that right.

MR. MITCHELL: That's accurate.

THE COURT: If you could come up and just

1 acknowledge that, and also state your name for the record. 2 MR. MITCHELL: I'm sorry, Your Honor. David Mitchell, representing the LeMond claims. 3 4 And Mr. Birinyi has accurately reflected our understanding. 5 6 THE COURT: Okay, thank you. 7 MR. BIRINYI: The next one is the Lone View. THE COURT: The what? Pardon? 8 MR. BIRINYI: Lone View. The Lone View objection 9 is, again, more or less a clarification. The Lone View 10 transaction, Your Honor, was: Lone View bought nine lots, 11 12 nine platted lots. But the agreement was that they were 13 actually only going to buy six density units, and the nine 14 lots were going to be reconfigured into six lots. 15 My understanding is that the documentation of that transaction is kind of confusing to the, to the 16 CrossHarbor real-estate lawyers. And I've spoken with 17 Mr. Elsaesser, and he's advised me that I can advise the 18 19 Court what we're going to do on that is enter into a side 20 letter as to how that's going to continue to close. 21 The substance, the economic substance of the deal 22 is going to be worked out between CrossHarbor and Lone 23 View, but the technical -- technically, it's still going to 24 be rejected as an executory contract because they need to rework slightly the deals. The Goulston lawyers and 25

Mr. Elsaesser are going to work - triple tracks now - are going to work over the next few days prior to us presenting the actual confirmation order to achieve that resolution.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BIRINYI: And they're going to be in touch starting this afternoon to try and resolve that. I don't think it's, it's -- once again, I think it's a win-win for both sides. So that's one of those deals where it's an economic deal that makes sense to everybody because the reorganized debtor gets three more density units that it can sell; and the Lone View folks, they've basically already paid for the nine units, so they're giving up three density units. They just need to figure out how to reconfigure that.

Now, Mr. Elsaesser also represents - and these are the individuals that are the Yellowstone Club World members - MacNaughton and -- I think they are, I think there are eight of them. The same way as the LeMond folks did, in recognition of the settlement agreement's term that gives exclusive authority to the uniform creditors under -- yeah, to the -- "uniform". "UCC", and it always confuses me. But the unsecured creditors committee, to negotiate, they've agreed to withdraw their objection, as well. And he authorized me to make that representation to the Court this morning.

1 THE COURT: Okay. 2 The final one, and I have to --MR. BIRINYI: because Mr. Bolter lives in -- Dubai, he lives in Dubai. 3 THE COURT: Did you say "Bolter"? 4 MR. BIRINYI: Mr. Bolter is the -- we've been in 5 communication with his counsel. He, as well, had an 6 7 objection that actually requests clarification on the cure 8 amount in the schedules. He's a member, a residential member, but he had, shortly before the filing, put a large 9 deposit that is reflected as a credit right now on his 10 11 account. We have proposals out to him, and his client is 12 considering them. CrossHarbor has tentatively agreed to 13 indicate that they would agree that he could continue to 14 keep that credit on the books for use against rental of 15 company-owned properties in the future. He hasn't built 16 his house yet, apparently, so when he comes to the club, which he does for about 20 to 30 days each year, he has to 17 18 rent the piece of property. And I think that's the ones that have been 19 20 resolved. We already talked about the two taxing 21 authorities. The only ones that I believe -- we haven't 22 addressed the members. 23 Jonathan, did you put a placeholder in? 24 MR. ALTER: Jonathan Alter, Your Honor, on behalf 25 of the members.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We filed a conditional objection to the plan, based upon a reservation of rights in light of what happened at the auction. Suffice it to say that in light of this settlement, the members are very gratified, very happy a resolution could be reached. And we withdraw the objection. THE COURT: Very good. Thank you. MR. ALTER: You're very welcome. MR. BIRINYI: And Mr. Beckett reminded me -what's Yoav's last name? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Rubinstein. MR. BIRINYI: Rubinstein. There was a glitch in the -- one of the schedules that we're going to modify. Mr. Rubinstein actually owns two residential memberships. And the second one, somehow or another, was omitted from the schedule. That's going to be added. So I think that leaves us --MR. WHITMORE: Your Honor? THE COURT: Mr. Whitmore. MR. WHITMORE: Your Honor, I just want to clarify, if I could, for the Class B folks, who voted in favor of the plan in its prior version and have filed a conditional objection receiving an extension of time to object, but I assume there will be an opportunity to review the revised plan and to either withdraw our objection or

```
1
     consent to the revised plan at some appropriate time, and
 2
     that that moment isn't passing here as we speak.
                THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Birinyi.
 3
 4
                MR. BIRINYI: Okay. Those are the resolved ones,
     which leaves us with, by my count, three unresolved ones:
 5
 6
     Mr. Sumpter, Mr. Blixseth, and Desert Ranch, LLP.
 7
                Mr. Blixseth and Desert Ranch, LLP, as I recall,
     incorporate all of the Credit Suisse objections, so those
 8
     will require the testimony that Mr. Patten's going to give
 9
10
     you.
11
                Mr. Sumpter, I believe, is actually a legal
12
     argument that we can basically take up either now or later,
13
     but at your convenience. I'm going to do the legal --
14
                THE COURT: Is there anyone here representing
15
     Mr. Sumpter?
16
                MR. BIRINYI: Stephen Mackey filed the objection,
     Your Honor.
17
18
                THE COURT: Okay. Why don't you just give me a
19
     brief -- and maybe we have to take that up later. We'll
20
     see.
21
                MR. BIRINYI: Mr. Sumpter has what's labeled as a
22
     residential contract, membership contract, but it is
23
     actually a nonstandard, if you will, residential contract
24
     because it requires the payment of dues never. So it's got
25
     free dues. Mr. Sumpter was -- and if -- we're prepared to
```

present testimony about this, if you want us to, but Mr. Sumpter was a general manager at the time Mr. Blixseth controlled the property.

On July 9th, at the same time that the marriage settlement agreement was signed, Mr. Blixseth and Mr. Sumpter signed a modification to his employment contract and converted his prior, prior membership interest into this unusual - as in it's the only one, as I understand it - but this unusual residential agreement that provided for no dues ever.

In addition, he has some estate assets that he hasn't turned over. I think we have -- he has a Porsche that the estate has title to, and he also has the liquor license for the Buck's T-4 property in his name. Of course, Montana liquor licenses have been to be in individual names. But the tenor of his objection to the plan is that the debtors, in their exercise of business judgment, shouldn't reject his residential membership contract.

The legal standard is business judgment and, I think, given all the facts and circumstances, the high probability that there's a dispute over his claim. In point of fact, it may well be that it was a fraudulent transfer at the time. Certainly, we take the position that the change in the terms of his employment agreement for no

consideration was a fraudulent transfer so that his claim 1 2 is, in all likelihood, going to be objected to. So we just think that the exercise of business 3 4 judgment is clearly on our side and that his objection, therefore, is not well-taken to the, to the confirmation of 5 6 the plan because, like I say, he just says we should assume 7 it and, instead, we reject it. 8 THE COURT: You know, you are prepared to put on some testimony to that? 9 10 MR. BIRINYI: Yes, Your Honor, if you want. 11 THE COURT: I think we should. Obviously, if he 12 raises the objection, he has the opportunity to attend this 13 hearing and raise it. Why don't we take it up. MR. BIRINYI: Okay. So Mr. Patten was going to 14 15 do the witness examination, because I think -- I don't know 16 whether you want opening statements on the Blixseth and 17 Desert Ranch objections or just go into testimony. 18 THE COURT: I think we just go to testimony, 19 sure. 20 MR. BIRINYI: Okay. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Patten -- oh, Mr. McKay. 22 Before we get into that, Your Honor, MR. McKAY: 23 I'm happy to come here on some more mundane matters just to 24 inform the Court that the debtor is current -- debtors are 25 all current, excuse me, in filing their monthly operating

reports. When I last left the office last Wednesday, the first-quarter fee had not been paid. Mr. Rezentes, I talked to him this morning, and it was his understanding from a conversation in probably April in Andy's office that those fees had been mailed as of Friday. So I haven't been able to confirm that, but I'm sure that they're good for the fees.

We have our outstanding motion to appoint a trustee and, Your Honor, I will withdraw that at this time without prejudice. Hopefully, things will go along and it will not be required to refile.

And lastly, because of this somewhat unusual plan structure and the liquidating trust, and so forth, I haven't had a chance to really think through everything thoroughly myself or discuss this with the debtors. But I would just ask the Court to retain jurisdiction of over any issues that we may have as to what will constitute a disbursement for quarterly fee purposes as we go forward and these transactions come to fruition.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm certain they really want to move it along quickly so they're not continuing to pay trustee fees.

MR. McKAY: Oh, I'm sure they will. And I think they can probably get a final decree entered and have the liquidating trust exist as an independent entity going

```
1
     forward. But I just want to make sure that if we have a
 2
     dispute, we will certainly do everything we can to work
     things out.
 3
 4
                THE COURT: Okay.
                MR. McKAY: But we never know, so --
 5
 6
                THE COURT: Right, I understand.
 7
                MR. McKAY: Thank you, Your Honor.
 8
                THE COURT: Mr. Patten.
 9
                It sounded like somebody was getting their money
10
     out back there to contribute, I guess, to the fund.
11
                MR. PATTEN: Your Honor, I'd call Ron Greenspan.
12
                THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Greenspan, if you would
13
     come forward to be sworn, please.
14
                   RONALD GREENSPAN, WITNESS, SWORN
15
                          DIRECT EXAMINATION
     BY MR. PATTEN:
16
17
     Q. Please state your name.
18
     A. Ronald Greenspan.
19
     Q. Mr. Greenspan, you're the CRO --
20
     Α.
         Yes.
21
     O. -- in this case?
22
         I'm sorry. Yes.
     Α.
23
         Are you familiar with the proposed Chapter 11 plan?
24
     Α.
         I am.
25
                THE COURT: Mr. Patten, maybe just for the
```

- 1 | record, disclose what "CRO" is.
- 2 Q. (By Mr. Patten) Could you briefly describe what is
- 3 | meant by "CRO"?
- 4 A. It stands for "chief restructuring officer". And I've
- 5 been responsible for most of the negotiations and have been
- 6 involved in the development of the plan of reorganization.
- 7 Q. Have you acted as a CRO in any other cases?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. How many?
- 10 A. As absolute formally a CRO, I mean a handful; and doing
- 11 those responsibilities as financial adviser, in very many.
- 12 Q. Is that what you -- that's the focus of your work,
- 13 right?
- 14 A. The sole focus of my work is debtor and creditor work
- 15 involved in major bankruptcies.
- 16 THE COURT: That's sufficient. I just wanted to
- 17 | make sure that "CRO", people knew what that meant in the
- 18 record.
- MR. PATTEN: Okay.
- 20 Q. (By Mr. Patten) Mr. Greenspan, have you helped
- 21 | formulate the terms of the proposed plan?
- 22 A. Yes, I did.
- 23 | Q. And you're familiar with the Credit Suisse/CrossHarbor
- 24 | settlement that Mr. Levy and Mr. Green described earlier?
- 25 A. I am.

- 1 Q. Were you involved in the negotiation of terms of that
- 2 settlement?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Does the settlement, if incorporated into the plan, put
- 5 into effect the Court's order issued about a week ago on
- 6 | subordinating a Credit Suisse loan to the claims of the
- 7 general unsecured creditors?
- 8 A. I believe it has that economic effect.
- 9 Q. Will the plan discriminate between any non-insider
- 10 general unsecured creditors?
- 11 A. I do not believe so.
- 12 Q. Will the plan, as modified by the settlement, provide
- 13 for full payment of the general unsecured claims,
- 14 | non-insider general unsecured claims?
- 15 A. It's certainly our estimate and expectation that it
- 16 does.
- 17 Q. Will the plan, as modified by the settlement, pay the
- 18 claims in the correct order of priority, given -- taking
- 19 into consideration the Court's order issued in the
- 20 adversary a week ago subordinating the Credit Suisse
- 21 claims?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. The first claims to be paid will be the administrative?
- 24 A. Correct.
- 25 O. Then the priority unsecured?

- 1 A. Correct.
- 2 Q. Then the general unsecured?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. And then the remaining funds will be distributed pro
- 5 rata, pari passu between the deficiency claim of Credit
- 6 Suisse and whatever the remaining unpaid unsecured claims
- 7 | are, including the insider unsecured claims?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Will any of the -- you're knowledgeable of the current
- 10 officers and directors, persons in control of the debtor
- 11 entities?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Is that Edra Blixseth?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Will she remain in control of the reorganized debtor?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 Q. Do you know who will be in control of the reorganized
- 18 debtors?
- 19 A. It will be a fund affiliated with CrossHarbor Capital.
- 20 Q. Okay. And to your knowledge, is that fund currently in
- 21 | control of the debtors?
- 22 A. No.
- 23 Q. Has the liquidating trustee been identified?
- 24 A. I don't believe so.
- Q. Do you know if it's anticipated that Edra Blixseth

- 1 | would be the liquidating trustee?
- 2 A. I do not think she will be.
- 3 Q. Okay. And are you aware of who will direct the trustee
- 4 | in the administration of the liquidating trusts?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 0. Who was that?
- 7 A. There's a board constituted, I believe, of seven
- 8 | members initially, four of which are -- I'm sorry -- yeah,
- 9 four of which are appointed by the prepetition secured
- 10 creditors, two by the UCC, and one by the Class B; with
- 11 most decisions requiring a majority vote, but some
- decisions requiring unanimity, particularly the choice of
- 13 counsel.
- 14 Q. You were present at the auction that was conducted last
- 15 | week in Billings?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And you're familiar with the various bids that were
- 18 | made at the auction?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Is the settlement price -- terms of the settlement, how
- 21 does that compare with where the bids were at the time the
- 22 auction was recessed?
- 23 A. At the point the auction was recessed, the then open
- 24 | bid was \$150 million composed of approximately 40 million
- 25 of cash and the balance credit bid. The settlement

- 1 | provide -- the settlement is nominally at 100 -- I want to
- 2 | say \$115 million; yeah, \$115 million, but provides
- 3 | meaningfully more cash to satisfy various unsecured
- 4 | creditors and to fund the litigation trust.
- 5 Q. Do you recall how the CrossHarbor bid was ratcheted up
- 6 during the course of the auction in relationship with the
- 7 Credit Suisse bid?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Was there an amount allocated to the CrossHarbor bid
- 10 taking into consideration the working capital that Credit
- 11 Suisse had -- or, excuse me, CrossHarbor had committed to
- 12 invest in the reorganized debtor?
- 13 A. Yes. I believe there was a \$10 million increment
- 14 associated -- a benefit given to the CrossHarbor bid on
- 15 account of the more favorable and secure terms.
- 16 Q. Okay. Had you had an opportunity during or before the
- 17 | auction process to review the Credit Suisse business plan?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And did you have any concerns regarding --
- THE COURT: Mr. Chehi?
- 21 MR. CHEHI: I'm going to object to the line of
- 22 questioning, unless there's a proffer of some sort to
- 23 justify why we would be exploring at this stage of this
- 24 | confirmation hearing the valuations, and the like, in
- respect of the auction process. Because we would certainly

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

take issue with the debtors' views of values and relative values and merits of the respective bids that were made by the parties during the auction which was truncated and not concluded. And with that, I -- you know, again, there may be some reason to get into this; but, otherwise, we're going to object to any proposed findings that would be determinative of the values of our bids, at least. THE COURT: Okay. MR. PATTEN: What I'm trying to establish, Your Honor, is: We do have an objection from Mr. Blixseth that incorporated all of the Credit Suisse objections. And so I think that it's necessary to have a record as to the adequacy of the terms of the Credit Suisse/CrossHarbor settlement to reflect what I believe is, is the -essentially, the stage of the auction when it was terminated. Well, is there any disagreement that, THE COURT: in fact, the settlement is, in fact, more value than where we were at at the time the auction was recessed? MR. PATTEN: Not, not by the debtors, Your Honor, but Mr. Blixseth may argue that it isn't. And I need to have a record for that eventuality. THE COURT: Mr. Chehi. MR. CHEHI: I think Mr. Greenspan testified just a few minutes ago that the consideration available to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

creditors directly through the settlement process and the consideration available through the settlement to fund the liquidating trust for purposes of generating additional value for creditors, under the settlement exceeded those respective values that were available under any of the proposals at the auction. And I think that would satisfy the showing that the settled outcomes and values are superior to whatever might have emerged on a preliminary basis at the auction. THE COURT: Okay. MR. PATTEN: What I'd like in the record, Your Honor, is Mr. Greenspan's -- I would like evidence that the terms of the settlement reflect a fair value for the property being conveyed to the reorganized debtor. THE COURT: Well, you may be able to just ask him that. MR. PATTEN: Okay. I mean and maybe he already stated THE COURT: that. MR. CHEHI: And, again, the clarification, it's the terms of the settlement are providing for and incorporating and adjusting the value that's being paid by the CrossHarbor acquisition entity for the equity of the reorganized company and not for the property of the debtors' estates or the assets.

1 MR. PATTEN: Okay. 2 I mean, also, I guess, you know, to THE COURT: add to the record, having been involved somewhat, I guess, 3 as a facilitator for a period of time in the matter, it 4 would appear, based upon what a has been related to me this 5 6 morning as to the conditions and the material contained in 7 the term sheet that, in fact, the settlement is of greater 8 value to the estate than where the bids were at the time, I guess, I recessed the auction to allow parties to go back 9 to the hotel to continue, if they wished to do so. 10 11 (By Mr. Patten) Mr. Greenspan, did you just hear the 12 Court's comments on the fair value? I did. 13 Α. Do you concur with that? 14 15 I concur completely. Α. 16 Ο. Thank you. 17 THE COURT: Would it matter? 18 MR. PATTEN: I need a record, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: I know. 20 MR. PATTEN: Maybe. 21 (By Mr. Patten) Mr. Greenspan, are you familiar with Ο. 22 the CrossHarbor business plan? 23 A. Yes. 24 And are you familiar with the projections of revenue 25 and expense?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. And in the course of your involvement as chief
- 3 restructuring officer, have you become familiar with the
- 4 historic revenue and expense of the various Yellowstone
- 5 Club entities?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 MR. PATTEN: Your Honor, may I approach the
- 8 | witness?
- 9 THE COURT: You may.
- 10 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- 11 Q. (By Mr. Patten) Mr. Greenspan, I've handed you what's
- 12 been marked as Exhibits A, B, and C. Do you recognize
- 13 those documents?
- 14 A. Yes, yes.
- 15 Q. Can you tell the Court what Exhibit A is?
- 16 A. Oh, after the late nights, I can't read small print
- 17 anymore, but the Exhibit A is the liquidation analysis that
- 18 was attached to the disclosure statement.
- 19 Q. And was Exhibit A prepared under your supervision and
- 20 direction?
- 21 A. Yes, it was.
- 22 | Q. Was it prepared based on information that you obtained
- 23 | in the course of your acting as chief restructuring
- 24 officer?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. And is it prepared in accordance with your knowledge of
- 2 | bankruptcy law and priorities, and such?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 MR. PATTEN: Your Honor, I'd move the admission
- 5 of Exhibit A.
- 6 THE COURT: Any objection? Exhibit A is
- 7 admitted.
- 8 EXHIBIT A ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE
- 9 BY MR. PATTEN:
- 10 Q. Can you describe to the Court what Exhibit B is?
- 11 A. Exhibit B also is attached to the disclosure statement,
- 12 and it is the summary analysis of the distribution of cash
- payment as of the effective date pursuant to the filed
- 14 disclosure statement and plan.
- 15 Q. And was Exhibit B also prepared under your supervision
- 16 and instruction?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And is it based consistent with your knowledge of the
- 19 then proposed distribution of cash as of the effective
- 20 date?
- 21 A. I'm sorry, yes.
- 22 | O. The proposed distribution has been modified under the
- 23 | settlement reached between Credit Suisse and CrossHarbor,
- 24 correct?
- 25 A. That is correct, as well as more cash available at

- 1 closing than indicated on this exhibit.
- 2 Q. Okay.
- MR. PATTEN: I'd move the admission of Exhibit B.
- 4 THE COURT: Any objection? Exhibit B is
- 5 admitted.
- 6 EXHIBIT B ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE
- 7 BY MR. PATTEN:
- 8 Q. And then, finally, can you identify what Exhibit C is?
- 9 A. Exhibit C is the pro forma projections of future
- 10 operations and cash flows as attached to the disclosure
- 11 statement.
- 12 Q. Was Exhibit C prepared by CrossHarbor?
- 13 A. Yes. For clarification, we have two sets of
- 14 projections that were attached to the disclosure statement:
- One showed, for lack of better description, the CrossHarbor
- 16 | anticipated business operations; and a second one, which
- 17 | was an alternative debtor projections.
- This is, in fact, the CrossHarbor ones that we had
- 19 reviewed.
- 20 Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the projections set out
- 21 in the CrossHarbor --
- 22 A. Yes, I am.
- Q. And does Exhibit C reflect the CrossHarbor business
- 24 | plan or at least the financial parts of the business plan?
- 25 A. As I understand it, yes.

- 1 Q. Is Exhibit C the business plan, as you know it, going
- 2 | forward from the effective date?
- 3 A. That is my understanding.
- 4 MR. PATTEN: Your Honor, I'd move the admission
- 5 of Exhibit C.
- 6 THE COURT: Any objection? Exhibit C is
- 7 admitted.
- 8 EXHIBIT C ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE
- 9 BY MR. PATTEN:
- 10 Q. Look, if you would, Mr. Greenspan, at Exhibit B.
- 11 A. Yes, sir.
- 12 Q. Taking into account the additional funds that will be
- 13 provided, cash funds that will be provided under the
- 14 | CrossHarbor/Credit Suisse settlement, are you satisfied
- 15 | that there will be sufficient monies available to pay the
- 16 administrative expenses of the estate?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And have you obtained information from the various
- 19 professionals as to the amount of the administrative
- 20 expenses of the estate?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 O. Will there be sufficient funds under the settlement to
- 23 pay the debtor-in-possession loan?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Will there be sufficient funds available under the

- 1 | settlement to pay the allowed priority claims?
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. And do you have an opinion as to whether the funds
- 4 available will be sufficient to pay all of the general
- 5 unsecured non-insider claims?
- 6 A. I believe they should be.
- 7 | Q. So the funds under the settlement which were
- 8 incorporated into the plan will pay all the costs of
- 9 administration, all the priority claims, and will satisfy
- 10 all of the general unsecured nonpriority claims?
- 11 A. They should.
- 12 Q. And do you have any anticipation that there will be
- 13 | funds above and beyond that that would be applied to the
- 14 | insider unsecured claims and the Credit Suisse deficiency
- 15 | claim?
- 16 A. There certainly should be.
- 17 Q. Do you have an opinion as to whether the plan, as
- 18 | modified by the settlement, reflects the best outcome for
- 19 the general unsecured creditors in this case?
- 20 A. I think it definitely does.
- 21 Q. Do you have an opinion about whether it reflects the
- 22 best outcome for the non -- or, excuse me, for the insider
- 23 general unsecured claims in this case?
- 24 A. I mean I believe so.
- 25 Q. Looking at Exhibit C, are you satisfied that the

- 1 | projections set out in Exhibit C are achievable in today's
- 2 economic climate?
- 3 A. I certainly think they're reasonable and probably
- 4 achievable. And given the contingency, the availability,
- 5 the capital commitment availability, I don't think there is
- 6 a significant probability that they won't be achieved.
- 7 Q. And have you done -- have you been provided any
- 8 information demonstrating or verifying the funds available,
- 9 the money available to CrossHarbor to invest this working
- 10 capital?
- 11 A. Yes, I've seen the auditor's reports.
- 12 Q. And does Credit Suisse have -- excuse me, does
- 13 CrossHarbor have the funds available to perform under this
- 14 | plan, including the injection of the working capital that's
- 15 | contemplated under the plan?
- 16 A. It certainly appears so.
- 17 Q. Do you have an opinion about whether or not a
- 18 | liquidation or further restructure is going to be necessary
- 19 in this case?
- 20 A. I do.
- 21 Q. What's that opinion?
- 22 A. That it is not likely.
- 23 Q. Under the settlement, will the nonprepetition lenders
- 24 | retain their liens under the plan or be paid the value of
- 25 | their liens --

- 1 A. I --
- 2 Q. -- under the plan?
- 3 A. I'm sorry. I believe so.
- 4 | Q. Are you familiar with the exculpation clause in the
- 5 plan?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Have any of the professionals in this case been
- 8 threatened during the course of these proceedings?
- 9 A. Well, people might have different opinions on that. I
- 10 think so.
- 11 Q. Is that a basis or purpose for the exculpation clause?
- 12 A. I think that's one of them.
- MR. PATTEN: Thank you. That's all I have.
- 14 THE COURT: Mr. Patten?
- MR. PATTEN: That's all I have.
- 16 THE COURT: Mr. Guthals.
- MR. GUTHALS: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 18 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 19 BY MR. GUTHALS:
- 20 Q. Mr. Greenspan, I'm Joel Guthals. You and I have met
- 21 before, right?
- A. We have.
- 23 Q. Good morning. I represent Mr. Blixseth and also Desert
- 24 Ranch, LLLP.
- On your Exhibit B that you were looking at just a few

- 1 | minutes ago, there is an amount at the bottom of that
- 2 document that sets forth the claim of Prim; is that right?
- 3 A. That is correct.
- 4 | Q. What's the amount of that claim?
- 5 A. What is shown on Exhibit B is \$10,095,123.
- 6 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Prim claim?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Okay. And you're aware that Prim filed an amended
- 9 proof of claim --
- 10 A. Yes -- oh, I'm sorry.
- 11 Q. -- in which they stated a secured claim in the amount
- 12 of \$4 million and an unsecured claim in the amount of
- 13 \$6,095,123.29. Are you aware of that?
- 14 A. I'm aware of the amended claim with that type of
- 15 | breakdown between secured and unsecured. I don't, sitting
- 16 here, recollect the exact dollar amounts, but it's in the
- 17 range of what you said.
- MR. GUTHALS: Your Honor, for the record, that is
- 19 Claim No. 224; and the amendment is 224, too, I believe.
- THE COURT: Thank you.
- 21 | Q. (By Mr. Guthals) Mr. Greenspan, I'm looking at the
- 22 claim, and it's dated March 18, 2009. Do you disagree with
- 23 that?
- 24 A. Well, I mean I -- do I disagree that you're looking at
- 25 it? No, I don't know. What I just told you was that I --

- 1 Q. You disagree that the amended claim was filed in
- 2 March 18, 2009.
- 3 A. I mean I know it was filed after the disclosure
- 4 statement, after the date of the schedule. I don't
- 5 recollect sitting here the exact date.
- 6 Q. Okay. And as chief restructuring officer of the
- 7 debtor, has the debtor done anything to object to this
- 8 claim?
- 9 A. My recollection sitting here is we have not filed an
- 10 | objection yet.
- 11 | O. Okay. And you're a bankruptcy expert, right? Is that
- 12 | correct, you're a bankruptcy expert?
- 13 A. I think so.
- 14 Q. Yes. And so you're aware that if a proof of claim is
- 15 | filed and no objection is filed against it, then that claim
- 16 | is deemed allowed; is that right?
- 17 A. Well, if no objection is ultimately filed, that's
- 18 correct.
- 19 Q. Well, as we are here today at the confirmation hearing,
- 20 | we have a claim for which no objection has been filed,
- 21 right?
- 22 A. That's my recollection.
- 23 Q. Okay. And so as we are here at the confirmation
- 24 hearing this morning, this claim, which is \$4 million
- 25 | secured and \$6 million unsecured, is deemed allowed, right?

- 1 A. Well, I'll leave that to the lawyers and judge to
- 2 determine the legal effect.
- Q. Okay. And what the plan seeks to do upon the
- 4 | confirmation is to have a satisfaction of the claim that
- 5 Prim exercises its foreclosure remedies, its full
- 6 satisfaction for the claim, right?
- 7 A. At the time that the disclosure statement was filed,
- 8 Prim's claim was fully a secured claim. It was prior to
- 9 the amendment. So I think the treatment you describe is,
- 10 in fact, what's set forth in the disclosure statement and
- 11 plan.
- 12 Q. Well, it's set forth in the second amended plan, is it
- 13 not?
- 14 A. I believe so, which I believe was early March.
- 15 Q. And, in fact, the plan -- I'm reading 1.100 of the
- 16 second amended plan, which is the plan that's before the
- 17 | Court this morning. It says that (quoted as recorded):
- "The Prim claims, meaning the claims of Prim
- 19 Vintage Development, LP, against YB and YC, which claims
- are alleged secured by the 160-acre tract of land located
- 21 within the Yellowstone Club and evidenced by a proof of
- 22 claim dated January 22, 2009, as amended by a proof of
- 23 | claim dated March 18, 2009."
- 24 Will you agree with that?
- 25 A. I believe so.

- Q. Okay. And then if we go to page -- I think this is
- 2 page 23 of the second amended plan, this is the table that
- 3 shows --
- 4 THE COURT: Mr. Patten.
- 5 MR. PATTEN: Your Honor, may I approach the
- 6 witness and give him a copy of the plan so he can read
- 7 along with the --
- 8 THE COURT: Certainly. You may approach.
- 9 THE WITNESS: Mr. Guthals, I'm sorry, can you
- 10 please repeat which section you're reading from?
- 11 Q. (By Mr. Guthals) Yes. I think, Mr. Greenspan, it's on
- 12 page 23 of the plan that sets the Court's docket number on
- 13 | it. This is the table that summarizes how the claims are
- 14 going to be treated.
- 15 A. Are you looking at the first mended or the second
- 16 amended?
- 17 Q. Second amended plan, sir.
- 18 A. Okay.
- 19 Q. This is the table that is in front of the section that
- 20 begins Article III.
- 21 A. Okay, I have that. That's on page 15 of the version I
- 22 | have, but it is the --
- 23 Q. Okay.
- 24 A. -- table that lists each of the classes and the claim
- 25 and the interest and the status.

- 1 Q. Okay. And then on that table, you'll see: Class 11-B
- 2 Prim secured claims.
- 3 Right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Do you see that? And the status is that it's
- 6 unimpaired, right?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. And that it's not entitled to vote, right?
- 9 A. Correct.
- 10 Q. Okay. And then if you will turn a few pages into the
- 11 | second amended Chapter 11 plan, you'll come to
- 12 Section 3.11.
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And that takes care of (inaudible) Class 11, the
- 15 Prim claim, right?
- 16 A. Actually, I think that's probably 3.1.1. Let me -- or,
- 17 I'm sorry, 3.11.
- 18 Q. Yeah, 3.11. And that entire paragraph, then, covers
- 19 | the Prim claim, right?
- 20 A. That is correct.
- 21 Q. And what this provides is that (quoted as recorded):
- 22 "The holder of the allowed Prim secured claim
- 23 | shall be entitled to commence any collection action
- 24 | pursuant to Montana law. And that's its sole and exclusive
- 25 remedy."

```
Is that right?
1
 2
         Correct.
     Α.
 3
     Q. Okay. And then it further says that (quoted as
 4
     recorded):
                "Provided, however, that in no event shall the
 5
 6
     reorganized debtor be obligated in any way on account of
 7
     any Prim claim."
 8
          That's what it says, right?
         I'm sorry, where are you reading from?
 9
     Α.
         The same paragraph, just down a few lines.
10
     Ο.
11
         Okay, let me get caught up with you.
12
     Q.
         Okay. I'm at 3.11.3, treatment.
13
     Α.
         Yes.
     Q. Okay. So I just want to make sure that we have a good
14
15
     record of this, that --
16
                MR. PATTEN: Your Honor --
                MR. GUTHALS: I'm sorry, did somebody say
17
18
     something?
19
                THE COURT: I was looking around myself,
20
     Mr. Guthals. I didn't see who said something.
21
                Mr. Patten?
22
                MR. PATTEN: We were going to start an objection,
23
     but we were premature, so --
24
                THE COURT: Oh, okay. Please proceed,
25
     Mr. Guthals.
```

```
1
                MR. GUTHALS: Thank you, Your Honor.
 2
     Q. (By Mr. Guthals) And the plan provides that (quoted as
     recorded):
 3
                "The sole exclusive remedy will be the
 4
     foreclosure action, and that in no event shall the
 5
 6
     reorganized debtor shall be obligated in any way on account
 7
     of any Prim claim."
 8
          Is that right?
         Correct.
 9
     Α.
10
     Q. Okay. And then it further goes on to say that (quoted
11
     as recorded):
                "On the effective date, the reorganized debtors
12
13
     will receive an option to purchase the Prim collateral from
14
     the owner of the Prim claim for $1."
15
          Is that what it says?
16
     A. Yes.
17
         And what happened, Mr. Greenspan -- we've seen what
18
     happened to the Prim secured claim, but what happened to
     the Prim unsecured claim of $6 million?
19
20
                MR. PATTEN: Your Honor.
21
                THE COURT: Mr. Patten.
22
                MR. PATTEN: I want to make an objection.
23
     calls for a legal conclusion. Whether or not Mr. Prim is
24
     entitled to a deficiency is a legal issue. Your Honor, we
25
```

have a seller-financed mortgage. And under Montana law,

```
1
     purchase money mortgages are not entitled to deficiencies.
 2
                MR. GUTHALS: Your Honor, I'm just asking the
     witness to explain what the plan provides.
 3
 4
                THE COURT: Mr. Patten.
                MR. PATTEN: Well, if that's the case, the plan
 5
     speaks for itself.
 6
 7
                THE COURT: Sustained.
                MR. GUTHALS: I have a few more questions, Your
 8
     Honor, if I may just have a moment here.
 9
10
                THE COURT: You may.
11
                MR. GUTHALS: Thank you.
12
     Q. (By Mr. Guthals) Mr. Greenspan, it's my understanding
13
     that in the settlement agreement that has been reached
     between Credit Suisse and CrossHarbor, there will continue
14
15
     to be nondebtor releases; is that right?
16
     A. Well, the settlement agreement involves additional
17
     parties than those two you just mentioned, but it does
     include nondebtor releases.
18
19
     Q. Okay. And none of us have seen these terms.
20
     Apparently, they're being worked out right now; is that
21
     correct? They're being hammered out in a separate room?
22
     A. No. I believe those terms have been finalized and are
23
     part of the term sheet that was executed. What is being
24
     worked on right now is simply the details of the
25
     post-confirmation credit agreement governing the
```

- 1 \$80 million note.
- 2 Q. Well, then you know what, what parties are covered by
- 3 | these releases; is that correct?
- 4 A. I've certainly read it, yes.
- 5 Q. So can you tell me: Is Edra Blixseth covered by the
- 6 releases?
- 7 A. My recollection --
- 8 MR. PATTEN: Your Honor, may I approach the
- 9 witness and provide him with a copy of the term sheet?
- THE COURT: You may.
- 11 THE WITNESS: Thank you. Mr. Guthals, I'm sorry,
- 12 the question was?
- 13 O. (By Mr. Guthals) I'm asking you, sir, if you can tell
- 14 us who was covered by these releases.
- 15 A. Well, first, it starts with the releases that are
- 16 provided in the plan, the second amended plan. So it
- 17 | starts with those. In addition, the pre -- excuse me, the
- 18 | prepetition agent and the prepetition lenders are added as
- 19 additional exculpated parties, as defined in the plan. And
- 20 then in addition, CrossHarbor, CrossHarbor Institutional
- 21 Partners, CIP Lending, CrossHarbor Capital Partners, LLC,
- 22 and their affiliates with interest in the Yellowstone Club;
- 23 in addition, the UCC and the members of the UCC, solely in
- 24 their capacities as members thereof, the debtors, the
- 25 reorganized debtors, the prepetition agent and prepetition

```
1
     lenders with respect to releases dealing with the
 2
     Yellowstone Club or the debtors.
         And then it further provides that the releases do not
 3
     apply to any willful misconduct by any individual person
 4
     with the fiduciary duties to the UCC, the debtors, or the
 5
 6
     debtors' estates.
 7
     O. Okay. Sir, does the second amended plan still call for
     a substantive consolidation?
 8
     A. It provides for a substantive consolidation only
 9
10
     amongst two of the - (inaudible) - been late; two of, I
     want to say, four debtors. But there's two entities that
11
     are substantively consolidated. But that's not changed.
12
13
                MR. GUTHALS: Okay. That's all the questions I
14
            Thank you.
     have.
15
                THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Guthals.
16
                Mr. Patten?
17
                MR. PATTEN: No redirect.
                THE COURT: Mr. Moore.
18
19
                MR. MOORE: Thank you.
20
                           CROSS-EXAMINATION
21
     BY MR. MOORE:
22
     O. Mr. Greenspan, you're familiar with the terms of the
23
     original plan and the treatment of creditors who are
24
     impaired and unimpaired under the plan?
```

A. Yes.

- 1 Q. Okay. And you're also familiar with the settlement
- 2 | agreement and how it affects the various classes of claims?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. Does the settlement agreement adversely impact any of
- 5 those classes of claims other than those who have agreed to
- 6 | the treatment provided under the settlement agreement?
- 7 A. I do not believe that it adversely affects any such
- 8 class.
- 9 Q. Okay. And with respect to the -- excuse me, the
- 10 Class 11 treatment in 3.11 --
- 11 A. You'll have to refresh my recollection of which is
- 12 Class 11.
- 13 Q. It's page 21.
- 14 A. Oh, the Prim secured claims.
- 15 Q. Yes.
- 16 A. Go ahead.
- 17 Q. Is it fair to say that section addresses the treatment
- 18 of the allowed secured claim of Prim?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Is there a separate section of the plan that treats any
- 21 | allowed unsecured claims that the Court may deem to be
- 22 allowed unsecured claims?
- 23 A. Yes. If and to the extent there is an allowed
- 24 unsecured claim, it would be a Class 4 general unsecured
- 25 | claim.

- 1 | O. So if the Court were to disagree with the debtors'
- 2 theory as to Montana law and Prim had an allowed unsecured
- 3 claim, where would that be treated under the plan?
- 4 A. Well, I think, given the objections that are likely to
- 5 be lodged against that claim, I think it would take more
- 6 than just a reversal on that one theory. But if Prim were
- 7 to have -- which it's now, of course, been transferred to a
- 8 | Tim Blixseth-owned entity. But if that entity were, in
- 9 fact, to have an allowed unsecured claim, it would be
- 10 | treated as a Class 4 claim.
- 11 Q. And it would be getting the same treatment and
- 12 distribution as any other unsecured claim?
- 13 A. Yes.
- MR. MOORE: Thank you. That's it.
- 15 THE COURT: Mr. Chehi.
- 17 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 18 BY MR. CHEHI:
- 19 Q. Mr. Greenspan, you're familiar with the treatment of
- 20 the prepetition lender claims under the plan as it would be
- 21 | modified to conform with the settlement agreement?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And does that treatment, in effect, provide that the,
- 24 that the claims of various administrative creditors and
- 25 Class 4 general unsecured creditors will be paid ahead of

- 1 the prepetition lender claims?
- 2 A. I'm sorry, Mr. Chehi, I lost the question.
- 3 Q. The question is: Does the -- will the plan, as
- 4 | modified by the settlement, provide that Class 4 general
- 5 unsecured creditors will be paid in advance of the
- 6 prepetition secured creditors with respect to funds that
- 7 are made available under the plan?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And you recall that the prepetition lender claims and
- 10 | liens were subject to and are subject to some pending
- 11 litigation in this Court in an adversary proceeding?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And is it your understanding that that litigation is
- 14 | complex and difficult and, in some senses, create some
- 15 uncertainty as to ultimate outcome?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And do you believe that the settlement of the treatment
- 18 of the prepetition lender claims and liens under the
- 19 settlement term sheet, which would be incorporated in the
- 20 | modified plan, is a fair and reasonable settlement under
- 21 | all the circumstances?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And do you believe that it's in the best interest of
- 24 | creditors generally in this case that that settlement be
- 25 incorporated in the plan as modified?

A. Yes.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

MR. CHEHI: No further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Whitmore.

MR. WHITMORE: Your Honor, Clark Whitmore. The Class B creditors do not support the Prim objection. I'm just here to, if I could, just make a record on a couple

CROSS-EXAMINATION

- BY MR. WHITMORE:
- Q. So, Mr. Greenspan, has the final version of the trust agreement been prepared yet and circulated?

minor points relating to our continuing concerns.

- 12 A. I believe there was a form that was attached to the
- disclosure statement. To the best of my knowledge, there's
- 14 been no modifications actually negotiated or agreed to.
- 15 Subsequently, I believe there will probably be some effort
- 16 to make some procedural operational improvements to that,
- 17 but that has not been a priority up until now. But I'm
- 18 | sure it will be done before the trust is effective.
- 19 Q. The trust agreement provided for a trust advisory
- 20 | board; isn't that correct?
- 21 A. That is correct.
- 22 | Q. And the initial version filed with the disclosure
- 23 statement in April provided for the ad hoc "B" members
- 24 group to have input on the selection of two members of the
- 25 | board ; isn't that right?

- 1 A. I believe that is correct.
- 2 Q. And then there was three members from the Class 4
- 3 claims that would also be on the board; isn't that right?
- 4 A. That is correct.
- 5 Q. And that's -- that would change the result of the
- 6 | settlement?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. And so the Class B holders would have an opportunity to
- 9 get one out of seven members on the board; isn't that
- 10 correct?
- 11 A. Well, the Class B holders were going to be a minority
- 12 before and they will continue to be a minority, but the
- current settlement agreement provides for one member.
- 14 Q. Yes, you're right. They're a minority in both
- 15 | situations, but they're a different minority; isn't that
- 16 | correct?
- 17 A. They're still shy of 51 votes, but that's correct.
- 18 Q. And there's going to be a number of other changes to
- 19 the trust agreement, right?
- 20 A. Well, I would anticipate -- I mean you've pointed up a
- 21 | number of items that it would be beneficial to clean up and
- 22 change, but I would anticipate there would be changes, but
- 23 many of them at your suggestion.
- 24 Q. Yes. And has a trustee been selected yet?
- 25 A. Not that I know of.

- 1 | Q. And this calls for the board to select the trustee;
- 2 isn't that right?
- 3 A. I believe so.
- 4 | Q. And is it the debtors' intention to file a revised plan
- 5 and then to go through at least a resolicitation with the
- 6 prepetition lenders and then have a follow-up hearing, or
- 7 | are we here to -- is it your understanding that today is
- 8 the actual confirmation of some sort of modified plan?
- 9 A. Well, again, I will defer to the lawyers. I would like
- 10 to believe that we will be able to achieve a confirmation,
- 11 | subject to certain post-hearing events such as a revote by
- 12 the prepetition secured creditors. But I'll defer to the
- 13 judge and counsel on the actual effect of this and the
- 14 mechanics.
- 15 Q. And the revised -- the modified plan will add the
- 16 prepetition lenders to the parties who are receiving an
- 17 exculpation and sort of a release of claims under the plan;
- 18 | isn't that right?
- 19 A. That is correct.
- 20 MR. CHEHI: I'll object to the characterization
- 21 | as a "release". It's an exculpation (inaudible) -
- 22 limitation of liability for defined purposes.
- THE COURT: Sustained.
- 24 Q. (By Mr. Whitmore) Is it your understanding,
- 25 Mr. Greenspan, that the exculpation provided here is

- greater than the exculpation contemplated by the bankruptcy
- 2 | code for participants in the plan process?
- 3 A. I mean I stopped practicing law 26 years ago, so I'll
- 4 leave that to the lawyers and the judge to determine.
- 5 Q. All right. Could you turn to Section 8.4 of the second
- 6 amended claim?
- 7 A. Yes, sir.
- 8 Q. I won't ask you to read what it says, but do you have
- 9 | an understanding as to the intended scope of what's being
- 10 provided for here?
- 11 A. Do I have an understanding?
- 12 Q. Yes.
- 13 A. I believe so.
- 14 Q. And what is your understanding of the protections that
- 15 | would be afforded to the parties who were included within
- 16 this?
- 17 A. Well, I mean again, I would think the best thing to do
- 18 | is to read what the language says. And under 8.4, about
- 19 halfway down, it says (quoted as recorded):
- 20 "These parties, the exculpated parties, they
- 21 | shall not have or incur any liability to any person for any
- 22 act or omission in connection with, relating to, or arising
- 23 out of the Chapter 11 cases, the formulation negotiation,
- 24 implementation, and confirmation -- or consummation of this
- 25 | plan, the disclosure statement" I'm skipping some

- language "entered into during the Chapter 11 cases, or
 otherwise created in connection with this plan."
- And then it goes on to say it doesn't include willful misconduct or gross negligence. And so what it was
- 5 intended, as that states, is that it would be an
- 6 exculpation for activities that occurred post-filing and up
- 7 until confirmation and excluding willful misconduct or
- 8 gross negligence.
- 9 Q. Right. So it's not intended to include (inaudible) -
- 10 release of any claims for any misconduct that occurred
- 11 prior to the bankruptcy case; is that right?
- 12 A. 8.4 was not intended to, correct.
- MR. WHITMORE: No further questions, Your Honor.
- 14 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Patten.
- MR. PATTEN: One question that Mr. Moore asked
- 16 raised one with me.
- 17 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 18 BY MR. PATTEN:
- 19 Q. Mr. Greenspan, you understand the duties and functions
- 20 of the liquidating trust?
- 21 A. I believe so.
- 22 Q. Does that include objecting to claims?
- 23 A. Yes, it does.
- 24 Q. So if there was an objection to the Desert
- 25 Ranch/Blixseth/Prim claim, that would be done by the

liquidating trust? 1 2 Well, either by the debtor in the next five - six weeks or the liquidating trust after its creation. 3 4 MR. PATTEN: Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Greenspan, you may step down. 5 THE WITNESS: Your Honor, may I just make one 6 7 comment? THE COURT: 8 I'll allow you to make a comment. Thank you. 9 THE WITNESS: What comment would you like to make? 10 THE COURT: 11 THE WITNESS: I just wanted to say: Everybody on all sides have put in, you know, tremendous hours 12 13 throughout this case. But, you know, after we left here 14 Friday the parties did relatively quickly reach an 15 agreement and then there's just been absolutely yeoman's work done by Skadden, by Credit Suisse, by the Bullivant 16 17 firm, by Mr. Patten, Mr. Beckett, and the members. And I 18 think throughout particularly the last three to four days, 19 and, quite frankly, through most of this procedure, there's 20 been a high degree of professionalism and certainly a great 21 deal of effort to get this to where it is today. 22 And then, also, I'd like to -- and, also, there's 23 been some commentary through this case about potentially 24 improper relationships. And I'll just tell you that in my 25 time being here, I haven't seen any of that. And I think a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

number of the parties, quite frankly, to some of their own personal detriment, have acted in the best interest of this estate. THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Greenspan. THE WITNESS: Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Patten. MR. PATTEN: We call Brad Foster. THE COURT: Mr. Foster, if you would come forward, please, to be sworn. MR. GREENSPAN: And I forgot to include Mr. Green, who's probably the one who hasn't gotten any sleep in the last 72 hours, in that list. THE COURT: I would acknowledge that. While you're stepping down and we're making room for Mr. Foster, I echo Mr. Greenspan's thoughts. Having spent quite a bit of time with, well, many of the parties, certainly probably all the attorneys, some that are here and some that aren't, I've been very impressed with, with the professionalism overall and the manner in which the parties have sought to reach resolution in this case, which probably from early -well, from about Thanksqiving on, I felt was going to have to happen if there was going to be any success in this case. It took awhile to get there, but there was that ultimate success, it appears. Although, I guess there's been no ruling yet on the settlement agreement itself

- 1 because of the taking of testimony, but I do commend all
- 2 the attorneys on the very professional work that they've
- 3 done in this case.
- 4 Mr. Foster, you can come forward to be sworn.
- 5 CHARLES BRADLEY FOSTER, WITNESS, SWORN
- 6 BY MR. PATTEN:
- 7 Q. State your name, please.
- 8 A. Charles Bradley Foster.
- 9 Q. And, Mr. Foster, you work for FTI?
- 10 A. I do. I'm a managing director for FTI Consulting.
- 11 Q. Okay. And so you've been working with Mr. Greenspan --
- 12 A. I have.
- 13 Q. -- in his role as chief restructuring officer?
- 14 A. I have.
- 15 Q. In the course of your work, have you become familiar
- 16 | with the membership agreements?
- 17 A. I have.
- 18 Q. In particular, are you familiar with the Robert Sumpter
- 19 membership agreement?
- 20 A. I have an understanding of the agreement, yes.
- 21 Q. Do you know the date of the agreement?
- 22 A. Not offhand.
- 23 Q. Do you know if it has any out-of-the-ordinary terms or
- 24 | conditions?
- 25 A. I do understand that it is characterized as a

- 1 residential membership with some unusual aspects,
- 2 particularly the nonpayment of dues.
- 3 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with any other residential
- 4 | memberships that provide that there's no payment of dues?
- 5 A. None that I'm aware of.
- 6 MR. PATTEN: Thank you. That's all I have.
- 7 THE COURT: Does anyone have questions for this
- 8 | witness?
- 9 You may step down.
- 10 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 11 THE COURT: Mr. Patten.
- 12 MR. PATTEN: I call Sam Byrne.
- THE COURT: Mr. Byrne, if you would come forward
- 14 to be sworn, please.
- 15 SAMUEL T. BYRNE, WITNESS, SWORN
- 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 17 BY MR. PATTEN:
- 18 Q. Please state your name.
- 19 A. Samuel T. Byrne.
- 20 Q. Mr. Byrne, you're a principal at CrossHarbor?
- 21 A. That's correct.
- 22 Q. And are you familiar with the development of the
- 23 debtors' proposed Chapter 11 plan?
- 24 A. I am.
- Q. Are you familiar with the terms in the plan?

- 1 A. I am.
- 2 Q. And, in particular, are you familiar with the so-called
- 3 | "trade creditor fund" of the plan?
- 4 A. Iam.
- 5 Q. Was that trade creditor fund included at the request or
- 6 insistence of CrossHarbor?
- 7 A. It was.
- 8 Q. What is the purpose of the trade creditor fund?
- 9 A. The trade creditor fund was critical to our
- 10 going-forward business plan if we were to be the acquiror
- 11 of the club in order to provide for payment to,
- 12 particularly to local and regional trades people and other
- 13 unsecured creditors that we would have to do business with
- 14 going forward in the community to ensure the success of the
- 15 club.
- 16 Q. So you would need to have a positive relationship with
- 17 | them in order to continue to receive goods and services?
- 18 A. That's correct.
- 19 MR. GUTHALS: Objection. Your Honor, I object on
- 20 the grounds of leading.
- 21 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 22 O. (By Mr. Patten) And, Mr. Byrne, was that determination
- 23 made for business purposes for CrossHarbor going forward?
- 24 A. It was made for business purposes for CrossHarbor going
- 25 forward should it be the acquiror of the club.

- 1 Q. Is that trade creditor fund, the net business purpose,
- 2 | is that essential or important, I'll say, to the business
- 3 plan of CrossHarbor going forward?
- 4 A. We felt that it was very important to the business plan
- 5 going forward and to the success of that business plan.
- 6 Q. Was there a purpose in establishing the trade creditor
- 7 | fund in order to gerrymander a vote of the trade class of
- 8 creditors?
- 9 A. Absolutely not.
- 10 MR. PATTEN: Thank you. That's all I have.
- 11 THE COURT: Anybody have questions of Mr. Byrne?
- 12 Mr. Byrne, you may step down.
- 13 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- 14 MR. PATTEN: I call Steve Lehr.
- 15 THE COURT: If you could come forward, please, to
- 16 be sworn.
- 17 STEVEN LEHR, WITNESS, SWORN
- 18 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 19 BY MR. PATTEN:
- 20 Q. Can you state your name?
- 21 A. Steven Lehr.
- 22 O. Mr. Lehr, you've testified here before, right?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. You're with CBRE?
- 25 A. I am.

- 1 Q. And are you the managing broker?
- 2 A. Managing director for the Land Service Group.
- 3 Q. Okay. And you've been responsible for the marketing of
- 4 | the Yellowstone Club, I'll say, as part of this bankruptcy
- 5 plan?
- 6 A. Yes, I have.
- 7 Q. I know you've testified about this before, but would
- 8 you briefly describe to the Court what the marketing plan
- 9 | consisted of? What steps were taken in order to expose
- 10 this property to the market?
- 11 A. Well, first of all, we did our own due diligence, went
- 12 | to the club, visited it. We prepared an offering
- memorandum, we sent out a brief summary of the offering
- 14 | memorandum to roughly 18,000 potential investor funds, and
- 15 then we received confidentiality agreements based on the
- 16 interest of those people that were solicited. And we
- 17 | received about 100 signed confidentiality agreements, and
- 18 | then we proceeded to follow up with them throughout the
- 19 course.
- 20 Q. Is directing an offering memorandum to 18,000 people,
- 21 is that ordinary in your work?
- 22 A. Yeah; for my group, yes.
- 23 | Q. Ordinary in terms of the number of people that are
- 24 contacted?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. Does the process usually, then, involve also
- 2 | the execution of confidentiality agreements?
- 3 A. Yes. And it varies per, per deal.
- 4 Q. Is it ordinary to have 100 confidentiality agreements
- 5 signed?
- 6 A. No. That was an extraordinarily high number.
- 7 Q. Did you say very high number?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Could you describe to the Court the level of, I'll say,
- 10 | market response to the offering memorandum and, and --
- 11 A. We received a tremendous response to the offering
- 12 | memorandum, to the teaser that we put out. We had one of
- 13 the potential bidders even go so far as to say that when he
- 14 was trying to find his funding, he had contacted someone in
- 15 | Switzerland and that person in Switzerland had received our
- 16 offering. And so they were aware of the deal.
- 17 Q. How long have you been in the real-estate business?
- 18 A. Well, I practiced law for about 8 to 10 years and then
- 19 have been in the real-estate business for about 12.
- 20 Q. Is the nature of your work in the real-estate business
- 21 | selling projects sort of, kind of like the Yellowstone Club
- 22 or of the same magnitude or complexity as the Yellowstone
- 23 Club?
- 24 A. We've not encountered anything this complex, or --
- 25 Q. But you sell undeveloped --

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. -- property?
- 3 A. Developed, undeveloped, and various stages of
- 4 entitlement.
- 5 Q. So sort of the general nature of the business is
- 6 | something that CBRE does have experience with?
- 7 A. Absolutely.
- 8 Q. Do you have an opinion as to whether the time period
- 9 that the property was exposed to the market from when you
- 10 | sent out your initial brief offering memorandum until the
- 11 auction last week, whether that is -- do you have an
- 12 opinion about whether that's an adequate time to expose the
- 13 property to the market?
- 14 A. Yes, I do.
- 15 Q. Are there any factors that you rely on significantly to
- 16 | conclude that that's an appropriate marketing period?
- 17 A. I think, you know, in my prior testimony, I have stated
- 18 that in this environment where the market is literally
- 19 moving away from us and given how difficult it is to get
- 20 | credit and funds into projects these days, that a shorter
- 21 | marketing period might be beneficial if the market is
- 22 | continuing to go down.
- 23 Q. And does that continue to be your opinion up through
- 24 today?
- 25 A. I believe the market is still moving away from us.

- 1 Q. Do you have any reservations about the adequacy of the
- 2 | time that's been allowed for you to market this property?
- 3 A. No.
- 4 Q. You're familiar with the bids that were received --
- 5 A. I am.
- 6 Q. -- on this?
- 7 You were at the auction for several days?
- 8 A. I was.
- 9 Q. Do you have any reservations about the process that led
- 10 to the auction?
- 11 A. The process that led to the auction?
- 12 Q. Yeah.
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. Do you believe that the auction brought out the market
- 15 | in terms of acquiring this property?
- 16 A. Well, I'm not as familiar with the exact bidding that
- 17 | went back and forth toward the end, as I had to leave. But
- 18 based on what I've seen, I believe that there was an awful
- 19 lot of scrutiny put into taking a look at what the
- 20 different components would be. And I believe that the
- 21 | price is a fair price, if that's what your question is.
- 22 O. There were only two bidders, correct?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Do you have any concern that either the process or the
- 25 | time period and the resulting two bidders, that there was a

- 1 defect someplace in either the time period or in the
- 2 process by which this was exposed to the market?
- 3 A. I guess my only commentary is that it took an awful
- 4 long time to get to this point, and I would have thought
- 5 | that it could have been done a little quicker. But that
- 6 | would be my general overall comment.
- 7 Q. As a broker, are you satisfied with the result, at
- 8 least as much as you know it, from the auction?
- 9 A. Yeah, I am.
- 10 MR. PATTEN: Thank you. That's all I have.
- 11 THE COURT: Anybody have questions for this
- 12 witness?
- 13 You may step down. Thank you.
- 14 MR. PATTEN: My last witness is Edra Blixseth.
- 15 THE COURT: If you could come forward to be
- 16 sworn, please?
- 17 EDRA BLIXSETH, WITNESS, SWORN
- 18 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 19 BY MR. PATTEN:
- 20 Q. Please state your name.
- 21 A. Edra Blixseth.
- 22 O. Ms. Blixseth, you were formerly married to Tim
- 23 Blixseth?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- Q. Are you familiar with the various business enterprises

- 1 that one or both of you owned during the course of your
- 2 marriage?
- 3 A. Oh, pretty much.
- 4 Q. Are you familiar with the Desert Ranch?
- 5 A. I'm familiar with what we call "Desert Ranch", yes.
- 6 O. Who owns Desert Ranch?
- 7 A. Tim received Desert Ranch in one of our many
- 8 settlements prior to the MSA.
- 9 O. Okay. So the Prim claim that Mr. Guthals has been
- 10 questioning Mr. Greenspan about, that claim was owned by an
- 11 entity owned by your former husband, Tim Blixseth?
- 12 A. I don't know about an entity. When he -- it was in our
- 13 personal names. And when that was divided in the second
- 14 | mini settlement, I believe it was, that went to Tim. And
- 15 | it was in his personal name at the time. And if it's
- 16 changed to an entity now, I'm not aware of it.
- 17 MR. PATTEN: Okay, that's all I have. Thank you.
- 18 THE COURT: Does anyone have any questions for
- 19 Ms. Blixseth?
- 20 You may step down. Thank you.
- 21 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- 22 MR. PATTEN: I have no further witnesses, Your
- Honor.
- 24 THE COURT: Okay. Does anyone else have
- 25 witnesses?

1 Mr. Patten. 2 MR. PATTEN: There's one more matter, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 MR. PATTEN: The liquidating trust is anticipated to take some time period to set up. About a month ago at 5 6 an emergency hearing - maybe a little bit longer - the debtors were instructed not to interfere with a prospective 7 8 sale of the Farcheville Chateau. Just so that, I quess, the record is clear and the debtors understand their duties 9 and powers and obligations, I would move the Court to 10 11 clarify that, pending the establishment of the liquidating 12 trust, which will then have authority over Farcheville, 13 that during that gap period, that the debtors have the 14 authority to control the affairs of the entities that own 15 the Farcheville Chateau. 16 THE COURT: Anyone have any objection to that, wish to add to that? 17 18 Mr. Chehi. 19 MR. CHEHI: The prepetition lenders have no 20 objection to that, Your Honor. And, in fact, under the 21 settlement agreement, we have a special interest in 22 Farcheville at this point. 23 And I think what Mr. Patten and we had discussed 24 asking the Court for a clarification is that, to the extent 25 that the debtors exercise their rights with respect to the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

subsidiaries and the Farcheville asset during this gap period, pending the establishment of the liquidating trust, that will not be in derogation or conflict with your prior order entered on the emergency motion which required people not to interfere with the sale of Farcheville. And we agree that the debtors' appropriate management of those issues would not, at this point, be an interference in contravention of your order. THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate the comment. Mr. Patten. MR. PATTEN: And I agree with what Mr. Chehi just said. That's what I intended. THE COURT: Mr. Amsden. MR. AMSDEN: Your Honor, just a point of clarification: We understand from French counsel that the Farcheville entity is in an involuntary French bankruptcy. And that may not be accurate information. But what we understand is that proceeding is proceeding in France. so with respect to the ultimate control of that asset and any recovery from that asset, my understanding is that that is in other country's jurisdiction. THE COURT: Well, from the standpoint of to the extent debtors in this gap period have any -- well, need to do anything, obviously this has been an asset that I've

been very concerned about for some time, and I'm going to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

direct that Debtors do anything that is within their organizational powers with various entities to see what the status is and to proceed accordingly in this gap period --MR. AMSDEN: Mine was just a --THE COURT: -- to maximize that asset, which I've always felt should be done. I appreciate your comment to the Court, though, about possible involuntary status of some proceeding over there. Obviously, it may be an item that has an impact by French government. MR. AMSDEN: And, Your Honor, mine was just a point of information; no more. THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Obviously, debtors should check into that and see what the deal is and act accordingly. MR. PATTEN: Your Honor, if I understand the procedure that we're following here, the debtor, Credit Suisse, and CrossHarbor will submit the term sheet to the Court as an amendment to the proposed plan. THE COURT: Apparently when -- the exhibit, is it finished, that is being worked on by Mr. Green and Mr. Levy? That's right. When the transactional MR. CHEHI: attorneys have finalized that attachment to the term sheet, I believe that term sheet, with the attachment, you know, fully executed, will be filed in the court as a public

record with a notice so that everyone has access to that.

And then the parties would plan to, over the course of this week, as soon as possible, modify the existing plan to incorporate and conform it to the term sheet terms and the transactions contemplated thereby and then file that, also -- (inaudible.)

THE COURT: Yes, this Court would certainly want,

I think, one document so that people aren't wondering where
the provisions are that are governing.

MR. CHEHI: And I believe the parties have also agreed submitting an agreed form of confirmation order that would - if the Court is inclined to confirm the plan and approve the settlement pursuant to the plan - submit an order accomplishing all of that at the same time the modified plan is submitted. And dual-tracking beginning today, as soon as possible, the debtors will resolicit the prepetition lenders with the assistance of the agent so that it can be accomplished electronically in addition to hard-copy solicitation to seek their revote and reballoting on the plan as it will be modified pursuant to the term sheet. And they will receive a copy of the term sheet with that solicitation and appropriate solicitation letters.

MR. PATTEN: But we'll need -- I think we'll need an order of the Court directing that prepetition lenders be resolicited in having a deadline fixed for the submission

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of ballots. THE COURT: We'll issue an order to that effect as well as that there can be electronic transmission to various, various people and have members so that -- to expedite that process. We'll do so. MR. PATTEN: Very good. MR. CHEHI: And just to close the record, Your Honor, we had filed an objection to confirmation of the plan asserting various grounds, and those are hereby withdrawn. To the extent that the Court is approving this settlement and the plan as modified, we would not be asserting these objections in that circumstance. THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Mr. Patten. MR. PATTEN: And just a point of clarification, You Honor. And without making any presumptions regarding the outstanding objections, is the Court issuing a tentative or preliminary order confirming the plan subject to the reballoting and the other documents that have just been described, or --THE COURT: Or what? MR. PATTEN: Or is it being held in abeyance until all of these documents come in, and so forth? THE COURT: Well, I'm sure what Mr. Whitmore is going to ask is that he have a chance to, if he doesn't agree with the language in the amended plan, to file an

```
1
     objection. I suspect that's where he's at.
 2
                MR. PATTEN:
                             Okay.
                THE COURT: And he's right on your left arm,
 3
 4
     so --
                MR. PATTEN: All right. And he usually is.
 5
                MR. WHITMORE: You're absolutely correct, Your
 6
 7
             I think that there ought to be some -- in addition
     Honor.
 8
     to the resolicitation of whoever they decide to resolicit,
     I think that some sort of backup date should be set just in
 9
     case the modified plan and all the -- and the trust
10
11
     agreement and all the schedules, when they get filed along
     with a confirmation order, if that can all be worked out,
12
13
     that's great; but absent that, there ought to be, you know,
14
     some opportunity to, to file a very limited objection and
15
     to be heard on the remaining outstanding points.
                            Well, you know, I would really like
16
                THE COURT:
17
     to just do it by notice and have whatever dispute you have
18
     worked out with the parties that are involved, to be quite
19
     honest. You know, I realize we've spent a lot of time
20
     together in the last week, or so. We know how sometimes
21
     that takes a little time to get accomplished. But I would
22
     really like to get to confirmation, subject to
23
     conditionally upon them submitting the amended plan with
24
     the incorporation of the term sheet terms.
25
                MR. WHITMORE: And all we're asking for is an
```

1 opportunity to see it all --2 THE COURT: I know. 3 MR. WHITMORE: -- and have an opportunity to file 4 an objection and be heard on that, in the hope and expectation that that won't be necessary, but just as a 5 matter of due process. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to take about a 8 10-minute break just so I can stretch a little bit. And I'll be back with a ruling. 9 10 (A brief recess was taken.) 11 THE COURT: Please be seated, as you get back to 12 your chair. Also, I didn't mean to overlook the 13 opportunity for anyone. Many of you already have made your 14 appearances. If there's anyone who's not made an 15 appearance for the record and you want to make sure you're 16 identified as having been here for whatever reason, you 17 certainly can come to the podium and make your appearances. 18 Certainly, I didn't want to exclude anyone. Okay, no one 19 wants to do that. 20 So, obviously, this is the evidentiary hearing on 21 confirmation, so I'll preface that if there's anybody who 22 wants to put any more on the record, this is the time to do 23 it. Okay. 24 MR. CHEHI: I'll just ask the Court to take 25 notice of the entire record of the Chapter 11 cases for

purposes of a decision of the confirmation order.

THE COURT: Certainly. Oh, it looks like we have some people back that maybe have been drafting, or maybe just for this.

Just from a timeline and a procedure standpoint, and it's been kind of the rule of this Court: When we started getting a lot of stipulations and additions to a plan that's before me, my experience has been the first thing that happens down the road, if there is an issue, somebody doesn't have the right document because they forgot that something was incorporated by agreement or by stipulation as to what governs what, or whatever. So based on that, as we've already discussed, I do want a modified plan incorporating the things that have occurred that are inconsistent with where we are today. Obviously, that was filed almost two months ago, about six weeks ago. Things have changed. So I do want one document.

Also, I already did the order on electronic transmission for the purposes of getting material out and balloting out for prepetition investors. I think that was for -- was that for Class 3 and Class 8? Is that correct?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, Your Honor.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's correct, Your

Honor.

25 THE COURT: And that can be done by electronic

```
1
     transmission. And I guess I'm wondering: Can those be
 2
     back by Friday?
                MR. CHEHI: I think it would be likely that most,
 3
 4
     if not all, would be able to respond within that period of
     time, assuming the solicitation goes out later today or the
 5
 6
     first thing tomorrow.
 7
                THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Birinyi.
                MR. BIRINYI: From the debtors' perspective,
 8
     that's certainly reasonable, Your Honor.
 9
                THE COURT: Okay. Let's shoot for that, then,
10
11
     unless there's an issue that comes to my attention later
12
     this week that, for whatever reason, something didn't --
13
     you know, the transmission lines were out, or something.
14
                MR. BIRINYI: I think that those same parties
15
     managed to get hard ballots in within a six-day period of
     receiving the solicitation package because we got the --
16
     through glitches, we got the addresses late.
17
18
                THE COURT: Okay. And so I quess what I'm
19
     understanding, they'll receive --
20
                MR. BIRINYI: They'd receive the electronic
21
     notification today. And if we can do electronic submission
22
     of the ballots, I'd suspect we'd probably have them
23
     actually back, most of them, Wednesday or Thursday rather
24
     than Friday.
25
                THE COURT:
                            Okay.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BIRINYI: But if the deadline is Friday --MR. CHEHI: I'd give it to Friday, you know, with leave to extend if the actual results are, you know, short of, you know, actually getting --THE COURT: So ordered. So we've got the document, we've got the term sheet. It looks like they're working on the attachments. That will be part of the record, as well. As it relates to confirmation and the remaining objections - some of which may be resolved, some may not basically, I'm going to, upon receipt of the modified plan and the receipt of the ballots, rule on the, on the confirmation and rule on the objections that are pending. And I guess I'm hopeful that there's a resolution, to the extent there can be, on the outstanding objections within that time period, as well, so that I'm not faced with something coming in that -- what I'm trying to do is not have to go to another hearing on this. And that's why I feel that since this is the evidentiary hearing, I'm going to rule on the objections as I see them, based on the evidence and the record, and go from there. Mr. Chehi. MR. CHEHI: And, Your Honor, will you also be ruling either today or conditionally today on approval of

the settlement terms as presented to the Court, based upon

```
the evidence, and the like?
1
 2
                THE COURT: I'm glad you brought that up. I just
     kind of overlooked it.
 3
                Based upon Rule 9019, my consideration of the
 4
     testimony, of the term sheet, negotiations that went into
 5
 6
     that, and based upon the - (inaudible) - property factors,
     the settlement set forth in the term sheet and its
 7
 8
     attachments is approved. We'll issue an order to that
 9
     effect.
10
                Is there anything I've missed? Is everybody kind
11
     of clear where I'm at?
12
                MR. BIRINYI: Would you like us to, when we file
     the modified plan, file a notification of which remaining
13
14
     objections are outstanding? When we file the modified
15
     plan, would you like a notification of which objections we
     haven't been able to resolve?
16
                THE COURT: Yes, I would, absolutely. And, also,
17
18
     you'll submit a proposed confirmation order.
19
                MR. BIRINYI: Correct, Your Honor, and proposed
20
     findings.
21
                THE COURT: That's fine, yes. Anything else?
22
                Mr. Whitmore.
23
                MR. WHITMORE: Yes. I guess it would just be
24
     helpful to know from a timing perspective when these
25
     documents are going to be filed.
```

```
1
                THE COURT:
                            Within the next, well, three days,
 2
     two days.
                            They'll be filed by the end of the
 3
                MR. CHEHI:
 4
     week, Your Honor, and they'll be circulated. And
     Mr. Whitmore will get a copy of them once they're in a form
 5
 6
     appropriate to be circulating around for comments. I think
     the debtors or counsel will take the laboring oar on that
 7
 8
     and get some comments. But you should see that as soon as
 9
     they start to materialize.
                THE COURT: I certainly want all the parties and
10
11
     all the people who have been involved to get copies.
12
                MR. WHITMORE: And if we could just have copies
13
     for, you know, a couple of days before an order is entered,
14
     or a day, as a matter of process, that would be
15
     appreciated.
16
                THE COURT:
                            Okay. Thank you, Mr. Whitmore.
17
                Mr. Patten.
                MR. PATTEN: We will make sure that Mr. Whitmore
18
19
     is included on the circulation of the drafts as they
20
     progress.
21
                THE COURT: Yes. Oh, that was the other thing:
22
     Did you wish to, in the modification and the plan, do a --
23
     I call it "red line" and you call it "black line", the
24
     final black line as well as the final plan without, without
25
     black line? Do you wish to file for ease of people
```

```
1
     reviewing?
 2
                MR. PATTEN: When we file the plan, we'll file a
     notice with a black-lined copy attached.
 3
 4
                THE COURT: Okay, very well. Mr. Levy?
                MR. LEVY: You Honor, just on a procedural
 5
 6
     matter, we're nearly complete with finalizing our comments
 7
     and revisions to the - (inaudible) - creditor agreement.
 8
     However, we have a hand markup. It will take -- you know,
 9
     they would have it all word-processed, and we'll be
     traveling back. I think we'd be prepared to file the
10
11
     settlement term sheet and have the attachment following the
12
     next day or two.
13
                THE COURT: Very well, very well. I appreciate
14
     your quick work on that.
15
                MR. LEVY: Okay, thank you.
16
                MR. MOORE: Your Honor.
17
                THE COURT:
                            Mr. Moore.
18
                MR. MOORE: Paul Moore for the record again.
19
     Just one more clarification: The Court's approving the
20
     extension of the DIP loan which is part of the settlement
21
     agreement?
22
                THE COURT:
                            It is approved --
23
                MR. MOORE:
                            Thank you.
24
                THE COURT: -- for the extension. And,
25
     Mr. Moore, just for the record so that I don't mix it with
```

```
1
     another date that I might have written down, what is the
 2
     extension dates?
                MR. MOORE: I think it was the later of the --
 3
     the earlier of the closing date or June 30th, as I recall.
 4
                UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's correct.
 5
 6
                MR. MOORE: Oh, I got it right.
 7
                THE COURT: Okay, that's correct. Is there
 8
     anything else?
 9
                Again, thank you all. I have appreciated getting
     to know you professionally through these last few months.
10
     Obviously, it's been a packed time period. Obviously,
11
12
     there's still some matters out there that we'll probably be
13
     seeing some of you, at least, in. So, anyway, again, thank
14
     you all, and good travels.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter, all done to the best of my skill and ability. Jonny B. Nordhagen